

CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY

MONTHLY MEETING

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

ANAHEIM CONVENTION CENTER

ARENA ROOM 1

800 WEST KATELLA AVENUE

ANAHEIM, CA 92802

TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 2016

9:30 A.M.

Reported by: Martha Nelson

APPEARANCESBOARD MEMBERS

Dan Richard, Chairman

Tom Richards, Vice Chair

Daniel Curtin

Lou Correa

Michael Rossi

Bonnie Lowenthal

Lorraine Paskett

STAFF

Jeff Morales, Chief Executive Officer

Janice Harlan, Board Secretary

Thomas Fellenz, Chief Counsel

Jon Tapping

Michelle Boehm

Marianne Veach

PUBLIC COMMENT - SESSION I

Kris Murray, Council Member, Anaheim City Council

Linda Culp, SANDAG

Philip Law, Southern California Association of Governments
(SCAG)

APPEARANCES (CONT.)

PUBLIC COMMENT - SESSION I (Cont.)

Rosa Park, StanCOG, San Joaquin Valley Transportation Agencies' Directors' Committee, RTPA Directors Committee and the Central Valley Rail Working Group

Doug McIsaac, City Of Bakersfield

Lauren Skidmore, Kern4HMF

Scott Hurlbert, City Manager, City Of Shafter

Rob Ball, Kern COG

Richard Chapman, Kern Economic Development Corporation

Patrick Kelly, Teamsters Local 952 and Teamsters Joint Council 42

Dr. Tom Williams, Sierra Club, Citizens Coalition for a Safe Community

Troy Hightower, TDA Association International

Mark Lehner

Doug Mangione, IBEW 441, Building Trades

Douglas Robbins, Painters and L.A. Trades District Council 36

Alan Nishio, Little Tokyo Community Council

Ernesto Medrano, Los Angeles/Orange Counties Building and Constructions Trade Council

Ray Angon, UA Local 582, Orange County Steamfitters and Plumbers

Kacey Auston, City of Chowchilla

APPEARANCES (CONT.)

PUBLIC COMMENT - SESSION I (Cont.)

Laurie Hunter, High Desert Corridor Joint Powers Authority (JPA)

Fran Inman, California Transportation Committee (CTC)

Marvin Dean, Kern County Minority Contracts Association

Keith Harkey, Ironworkers Local 433

PUBLIC COMMENT - SESSION II

Michael Cano, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, Supervisor Antonovich's Office

Marsha Mclean, Council Member, City Of Santa Clarita

Sylvia Ballin, Council Member, City Of San Fernando

Nelson Pichardo, Office of State Assemblyperson Patty Lopez

Joel Fajardo, Vice Mayor, City of San Fernando

Robert Gonzales, Mayor, City Of San Fernando

Brian Saeki, City Manager, City Of San Fernando

Nick Kimball, Finance Director, City Of San Fernando

David Cameron, Teamsters Rail Conference

Kathleen Trinity, Oppose High Speed Rail in Acton

Jacqueline Ayer, Acton Town Council

Frank Oliveira, Citizens for California High-Speed Rail Accountability (CHSRA)

John Teal, Attorney for UltraSystems Environmental Inc.

APPEARANCES (CONT.)

PUBLIC COMMENT - SESSION II (Cont.)

David Bernal

Steven Bravo

Janet Gibson

Ralph Hurst, S.A.F.E. Save Angeles Forest for Everyone

Robin Turner, ArchaeoPaleo Resource Management, Inc

Betsy Lindsay, UltraSystems Environmental, Inc.

David DePinto, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association

Cindy Bloom, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association

Patricia Romar

Jackie Gamble, S.A.F.E Coalition

Clark Schickler

Lois Dayen, Shadow Hills/S.A.F.E Coalition

Nina Royal, Sunland-Tujunga Neighborhood Council

Sue Mansis, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association

Katherine Dayen, Shadow Hills/S.A.F.E Coalition, SHPOA

Bill Eick, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association

Cile Borman, Lakeview Terrace Resident

Joanne Fernandez, Former Mayor, City Of San Fernando

Josephine Zarate, FTDNC

Gerri Summe

<u>INDEX</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Roll Call	7
1. Closed Session Pertaining to Litigation (January 11, 2016 5:00 p.m.)	
Public Comment: Session I	8
2. Consider Approving the Board Meeting Minutes From the March 8, 2016 Meeting	53
3. Consider Adopting the Risk-Informed Contingency for the Construction Package 4 Design-Build Contract	54
4. Consider Delegating Authority to Negotiate and Finalize Agreements with the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railway	66
5. Update on the Draft 2016 Business Plan and Comments Received	88
Public Comment: Session II	91
6. Report on the Bakersfield to Palmdale Supplemental Alternatives Analysis	162
7. Report on the Palmdale to Burbank Supplemental Alternatives Analysis	167
8. Report on the Burbank to Los Angeles Supplemental Alternatives Analysis	169
9. Report on the Los Angeles to Anaheim Supplemental Alternatives Analysis	171
10. Update on the Los Angeles to San Diego Project Section	173
Adjourned	175

P R O C E E D I N G S

9:39 a.m.

PROCEEDINGS BEGIN AT 9:39 A.M.

ANAHEIM, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 2016

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning, everyone.
Welcome to this meeting of the High-Speed Rail Authority.
We're happy to be here in beautiful Anaheim this morning
and we'll start the meeting with the roll call.

Could the Secretary please call the roll?

MS. HARLAN: Vice Chair Richards?

VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Here.

MS. HARLAN: Director Rossi?

BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Here.

MS. HARLAN: Director Correa?

BOARD MEMBER CORREA: Here.

MS. HARLAN: Director Curtin?

BOARD MEMBER CURTIN:

MS. HARLAN: Director Paskett?

BOARD MEMBER PASKETT:

MS. HARLAN: Director Lowenthal?

BOARD MEMBER LOWENTHAL: Here.

MS. HARLAN: Chair Richard?

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Here.

We have a quorum. There's no flag in the room,
it'll be projected on the screen. Will you please join me

1 in honoring America with the Pledge of Allegiance?

2 (The Pledge of Allegiance is made.)

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. We're going to
4 have a number of public comments today. And let me just
5 remind people, if you haven't already filled out a comment
6 card the yellow cards will be associated with people who
7 would like to comment on items two through five. And the
8 green cards will be for people who want to comment on the
9 other items relating to the supplemental alternatives
10 analyses. And I think that there are people in the back
11 who can help you with that.

12 Because we have a lot of speakers today we're
13 going to have some strict time limits, but we'll afford
14 people adequate time to make their comments. Before we
15 begin, we're graced with the presence of Kris Murray, the
16 Honorable Kris Murray, a member of the Anaheim City
17 Council, someone whom we know very well.

18 (Applause.)

19 And she's asked to welcome us to Anaheim, so
20 Councilmember Murray?

21 (Colloquy regarding microphones)

22 COUNCILMEMBER MURRAY: Good morning, everybody
23 and good morning Mr. Chairman, and Members of the
24 Authority, and your staff. Thank you for holding this
25 meeting in Anaheim.

1 The City has had a long and passionate commitment
2 to this project, have worked with you since the very
3 beginning planning stages. Very proud to stand here today
4 and Anaheim is high-speed rail ready with the opening a
5 little more than a year ago with our new intermodal station
6 which is also not just intermodal but international with
7 daily service to Mexico. And our ridership is steadily
8 increasing.

9 But unlike the high-speed rail authority, ARTIC
10 was also for future mobility needs. And this project is
11 absolutely essential to a long term ability of our state
12 and our region. And the City is a committed partner to
13 working with you and members of the Legislature as well as
14 community and stakeholders statewide.

15 Other stakeholders locally just want to reinforce
16 that in addition to the City of Anaheim, we have a number
17 of local stakeholders visit Anaheim, which is the
18 Convention and Visitors Bureau for all of Orange County, is
19 supportive of the project. The Chamber of Commerce in
20 Anaheim, Angels Baseball, the Pacific Division Champions,
21 Anaheim Ducks and Honda Center are supportive as well. The
22 Disneyland Resort and the Orange County Business Council,
23 and that's just to name a few in the interest of time.

24 Orange County has a broad coalition of support
25 for high-speed rail and this project. We appreciate the

1 time that has gone into meticulously studying both
2 ridership and the business models in making sure that your
3 value engineering and reducing costs with each iteration of
4 the Business Plan. We're also extremely appreciative of
5 the \$4 billion in investment by working with the
6 Authority's available funds and your partners that are
7 looking for early investment in Southern California.

8 Anaheim has project ready, shovel ready projects
9 we'd love to explore with you, but so do many cities and
10 counties across this region. We look forward to hearing
11 more about the Business Plan and your plans to unlock a
12 significant private capital in this project to insure that
13 it is financially self-sustaining.

14 So with that being said, I just want to thank you
15 again for the opportunity to welcome you. Please let us
16 know if there's anything we can do to help facilitate
17 today.

18 And we welcome everybody who's here in the great
19 City of Anaheim. Anaheim was built on innovation and
20 vision and to quote the Chairman "imagination," all of
21 which are needed to ensure this project comes to fruition.
22 And I believe in the long term interest of the State, it
23 will. So thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much.
25 (Applause)

1 It's noteworthy, as Councilmember Murray just
2 noted, that part of the Business Plan that we'll be taking
3 your comments on today does involve early investments here
4 in the corridor between Burbank, Los Angeles Union Station,
5 and Anaheim. Obviously, that's a key part of our Business
6 Plan and so it's very appropriate that we be here today.
7 And again appreciate -- I continually refer to her as Mayor
8 Kris Murray. So welcome, but Councilmember, thank you.

9 COUNCILMEMEMBER MURRAY: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: We have a number of business
11 cards. It's our business practice to put elected officials
12 first. Several of the elected officials have asked to be
13 grouped with members of their community, so for today we're
14 just going to go through the cards in the order in which
15 they are received.

16 We do have a lot of speakers, but these are
17 important issues. So I'm going to ask everybody to confine
18 their comments to three minutes, which we will strictly
19 enforce just so that we can make sure that all citizens
20 have an equal opportunity to present their views.

21 So with that after the roll call we've been
22 joined by Ms. Paskett. And so welcome.

23 All right, first Linda Culp from SANDAG followed
24 by Phillip Law from Southern California Association of
25 Governments, and then Rosa Park from San Joaquin Valley

1 Transportation Authority. And it looks -- I don't know if
2 that is going to be taken out of the holder or not, so do your
3 best.

4 MS. CULP: Chairman Richard, Members of the
5 Board, thank you for the opportunity to speak this morning
6 and for holding your meeting in Anaheim. We always like to
7 have you here in Southern California.

8 We in San Diego see the importance of both
9 conventional and high-speed connections. We have an
10 established market for rail along the LOSSAN Corridor that
11 will provide feeder service here in Anaheim and in Los
12 Angeles. And this happens to be right now the second
13 busiest corridor in the nation and home to more than 21
14 million residents.

15 We continue to work with our other Southern
16 California partners and the Authority to implement a
17 Memorandum of Understanding between eight of our agencies
18 to work cooperatively with the Authority on these
19 improvements. We also see high-speed service along our
20 Inland Empire corridor important not only to connect with
21 L.A. and San Diego and Northern California, but also those
22 important connections within the region between San Diego
23 and the Inland Empire.

24 We'll continue to work with your staff on these
25 details. And we appreciate your attention to make

1 improvements to both the Inland and the Coastal Rail
2 Corridors.

3 Overall, our comments on the Draft Business Plan
4 are to strengthen the language to fully implement the
5 strategies and the projects in the MOU. We truly do have
6 shovel-ready projects in San Diego. And to further detail
7 plans for your Phase 2 corridors.

8 So with that, thank you for meeting in Southern
9 California this morning and your consideration of the
10 SANDAG comments.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Culp.

12 Phillip Law and then Rosa Park and then Douglas
13 McIsaac.

14 MR. LAW: Good morning, Chairman Richard, Board
15 Members, Mr. Morales. I'm Phillip Law, with the Southern
16 California Association of Governments or SCAG. Our
17 Executive Director, Hasan Ikhata, sends his regrets that
18 he can't be here today to speak to you.

19 SCAG is the nation's largest metropolitan
20 planning organization representing six counties, 191 cities
21 and almost 19 million people; just under half of
22 California's population. We are the 16th largest economy
23 in the world with a regional gross domestic product of \$1
24 trillion.

25 Last Thursday our Regional Council adopted the

1 2016 Regional Transportation Plan Sustainable Community
2 Strategy or RTPSCS, which identifies half a trillion
3 dollars in multimodal investments through the year 2040.
4 The RTPSCS balances the region's future mobility and
5 housing needs with economic, environmental and public
6 health goals. In adopting the RTPSCS, the Regional Council
7 reaffirmed its support for the high-speed train by
8 including Phase 1 in the financially-constrained plan.

9 SCAG has supported the high-speed train since
10 2012, when we entered into a Memorandum of Understanding or
11 MOU with the Authority and other regional agencies.
12 Through this MOU the Authority committed \$1 billion of Prop
13 1A and other funding sources to implement near term rail
14 improvements on the Phase 1 Corridor and on the feeder rail
15 corridors including our existing Metrolink and Amtrak
16 systems.

17 This program of early investments supports the
18 blended approach to implementing the high-speed train
19 through increased interregional connectivity of existing
20 rail services. And is a significant component of the
21 State's rail modernization priority.

22 By revising the initial operating segment to
23 connect north rather than south as previously envisioned,
24 the Business Plan delays the arrival of high-speed train to
25 our region. But because of this, the MOU investments

1 become all the more crucial.

2 SCAG appreciates the Authority's continuing
3 commitment to the MOU projects as reiterated by Chairman
4 Richard to the Regional Council last February. We urge the
5 Authority to continue its partnership with the MOU agencies
6 and take action to fund key MOU projects that are ready to
7 advance.

8 Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you
9 today.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Law. And
11 please give our respects to Mr. Ikhata. Thank you.

12 Ms. Park followed by Douglas McIsaac.

13 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning.

14 MS. PARK: Good morning, Chair Richard and
15 Members of the California High-speed Rail Authority. I am
16 Rosa Park, the Executive Director for the Stanislaus
17 Council of Governments. I am also a member of the San
18 Joaquin Valley Regional Transportation Planning
19 Authorities' called the RTPA Directors Committee, and the
20 Central Valley Rail Working Group. I am here representing
21 each of these entities.

22 The San Joaquin Valley RTPA Directors Committee
23 represents the eight counties of the San Joaquin Valley:
24 San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, Madera, Fresno, Kings,
25 Tulare and Kern. The Central Valley Working Group includes

1 all of the regional transportation planning agencies,
2 regional rail operators in major cities in the Sacramento
3 to Merced Corridor. Both the RTPA Directors and the
4 Central Valley Working Group unanimously approved the same
5 comment letter of the Draft 2016 California High-Speed Rail
6 Authority Business Plan. I have brought copies of this
7 letter for you.

8 The San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council,
9 which is made up of elected officials throughout the San
10 Joaquin Valley is holding an emergency meeting to take
11 action on this letter as well.

12 The San Joaquin Valley and Sacramento are very
13 unhappy with the Draft Business Plan. For many years the
14 promise of early high-speed rail connection to Merced, and
15 improvements to conventional rail services commonly called
16 the blended-service concept, have been essential for
17 support from our region. The Draft 2016 Plan eliminates
18 the early connection to Merced and has the initial southern
19 terminus in an almond orchard north of Bakersfield.

20 The Draft Plan does not propose blended service,
21 investment priorities for the San Joaquin's ACE Capitol
22 Corridor services, which make up the Northern Unified
23 Service, which was a key component of both your 2012 and
24 2014 Business Plans.

25 We request that the California High-Speed Rail

1 Authority fulfill the promise in the prior Business Plans
2 and support funding for the blended services needs in
3 Northern California and to extend the high-speed rail to
4 Merced.

5 Support from Northern and San Joaquin Valley and
6 Sacramento helped pass Proposition 1A. And members of our
7 Legislature from these regions provided key votes for you
8 in 2012 and 2014. We are hopeful that in short time
9 remaining, you will work with us to make changes to your
10 Business Plan, so that it can be supported by Sacramento,
11 the San Joaquin Valley, and parts of the Bay Area not
12 served by high-speed rail.

13 On a final note, the major changes in this Draft
14 came without warning or any discussion with local or
15 regional partners and elected officials who have stood by
16 this project for many years. Thank you for the opportunity
17 to speak.

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Park.

19 Douglas McIsaac followed by Lauren Skidmore and
20 then Scott Hurlbert.

21 MR. MCISSAC: Good morning Chairman Richard and
22 Members of Board. I am here today representing the City of
23 Bakersfield, which will hopefully by the southern terminus
24 of the initial operating segment. And before I begin my
25 other comments I first want to send my thanks and

1 appreciation to Mr. Morales and his staff for the very good
2 working relationship that the City has enjoyed with the
3 Authority over the past few years. It's been very much
4 appreciated.

5 But with that, I'm here today to personally
6 communicate a very significant concern that the City of
7 Bakersfield has regarding the Draft Business Plan and not
8 surprisingly that relates to fact that the Business Plan
9 established that because of funding limitations, the
10 initial operating segment may not extend all the way to
11 Downtown Bakersfield and may instead terminate at an
12 interim station north of Bakersfield.

13 We do appreciate that the Business Plan states
14 that the Authority will be seeking the additional funds
15 that would be necessary to extend the IOS all the way to
16 Downtown Bakersfield, but nevertheless the City is very
17 much opposed to any scenario wherein the southerly terminus
18 of the IOS would not be in Downtown Bakersfield, whether
19 that be in a permanent or an interim station.

20 In our comment letter that has been submitted to
21 you we identified a multitude of reasons why the City
22 contends that an interim station at Poplar Avenue would not
23 be appropriate, which I won't take my limited time to
24 elaborate on right now. And I also understand that it now
25 may be proposed to locate an interim station at Wasco

1 instead of Poplar Avenue, as this would presumably be less
2 costly and less environmentally impactful. And while that
3 could be the case, any interim station along CP4 still
4 results in some disadvantages to the operational
5 efficiencies of the southerly end of the IOS.

6 And if the funding is not available to extend the
7 permanent alignment to the new Bakersfield high-speed rail
8 station, the City has identified several alternatives in
9 which high-speed rail service still could be extended to
10 the current Amtrak station in downtown Bakersfield on an
11 interim basis. And operationally, this achieves two
12 important things that an interim station north of
13 Bakersfield does not.

14 First, it would substantially increase the
15 ridership on the initial operating segment to and from
16 Bakersfield, particularly within the San Joaquin Valley.
17 There is currently no proposal to transport passengers from
18 the interim station to Bakersfield. And with the station
19 25 or 30 miles north of Bakersfield the viability of high-
20 speed rail, as a transportation option for Greater
21 Bakersfield becomes substantially diminished.

22 Secondly, and as you may be aware, the
23 Bakersfield Amtrak Station is already the focus for bus
24 feeder service to Southern California. And the
25 convenience, the extent, and the physical facilities that

1 are available now to provide that high-speed bus feeder
2 service to Southern California would be greatly improved
3 and greatly enhanced, than it would be from any station
4 north of Bakersfield.

5 So with that the City would strongly encourage
6 and greatly appreciate it, if in the final Business Plan
7 that at least a potential option of interim service to
8 Downtown Bakersfield be included, even if that may be in
9 addition to the option of an interim station at some other
10 location. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir. We will be
12 taking these comments very seriously. Thank you.

13 Lauren Skidmore followed by Scott Hurlbert.

14 MS. SKIDMORE: Chairman Richard and Members of
15 the Board of Directors. The members of Kern4HMF, a
16 coalition of individuals, businesses, schools and
17 government entities, who strongly support the location of
18 the high-speed train system's heavy maintenance facility in
19 Kern County, are writing to express our opposition to the
20 Authority's proposed termination of IOS at Poplar Avenue.

21 Truncating (phonetic) high-speed rail service in
22 an undeveloped remote area presents large infrastructure
23 and transportation connectivity challenges, guarantees the
24 creation of urban sprawl with a substantial impact on farm
25 land, traffic and air quality. And severely handicaps the

1 system's ability to attract initial ridership, interim or
2 not. Moreover, all of these outcomes violate Proposition
3 1A provisions, which would open the project to further
4 legal challenges.

5 Terminating the IOS at Poplar Avenue would also
6 preclude the location of the heavy maintenance facility at
7 a proposed site near Shafter that offers cost, logistical
8 and environmental advantages unmatched by any other
9 potential sites. The Draft Business Plan presents a little
10 to no justification for stopping the IOS not only short of
11 Bakersfield, the system's gateway to the Southern
12 California passenger market, but short of a competitive HMF
13 site.

14 The plan also fails to address the challenges of
15 creating a station in a rural area that is not included in
16 the approved Fresno to Bakersfield EIR and whose
17 development will present added infrastructure and
18 environmental review costs. We respectfully urge the
19 Authority to explore alternatives to the Poplar Avenue
20 Terminus and north of Bakersfield station that will satisfy
21 statutory requirements while fostering the immediate
22 success of the system.

23 High-speed rail needs Los Angeles Basin ridership
24 to promote the entire high-speed rail system. Instead of
25 ending the IOS at Poplar Avenue other options will better

1 promote the initial success of high-speed rail and will
2 enable its steady expansion. Kern4HMF desires to explore
3 these alternatives with Authority Board Members and staff
4 and we urge the Authority not to approve its Business Plan
5 as is. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Skidmore.
7 Scott Hurlbert, followed by Rob Ball.

8 MR. HURLBERT: Good morning Chairman and the
9 Members of the Board. I am Scott Hurlbert, City Manager of
10 the City of Shafter.

11 I think these two speakers really covered all of
12 the points that are important today. I would strongly urge
13 each of you to review the comment letters that are coming
14 from those jurisdictions and agencies in Kern County.
15 There is some important information, also some technical
16 solutions to some of the impacts that Lauren in particular
17 just cited: the urban sprawl, the lack of infra structure
18 in the proposed Poplar's interim station area -- just not
19 an optimum, less than optimum actually, location for an
20 interim station.

21 So I would definitely ask that you consider the
22 comments that you will be receiving, especially the report
23 from Kern COG and then you consider an alternate location
24 for that interim station. And then also give the Shafter
25 HMF site a fair chance during the selection process. Thank

1 you.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

3 Rob Ball followed by Richard Chapman.

4 MR. BALL: Thank you Chair, Committee Members.
5 I'm Rob Ball, Planning Director for Kern Council of
6 Governments.

7 And I wanted to thank your staff for the kickoff
8 meeting that we had last Friday in Kern on Bid Segment 4,
9 which is from North Kern County all the way to just north
10 of Shafter, that 22-mile segment. We were hearing some
11 very encouraging things from the consultant that's working
12 on that where they're actually doing some changes that add
13 additional undercrossing for both the high-speed rail line
14 and the BNSF.

15 And it's that type of responsiveness to the
16 comments that we at Kern COG and Kern County are looking
17 for from the Authority. That when you can build something
18 that benefit's and helps mitigate an existing problem along
19 that BNSF Corridor it's very beneficial to the region, to
20 the community. And it's not just focused on high-speed
21 rail and its movement, but also the circulation within the
22 region.

23 The other interesting thing that we noted is that
24 we believe that that segment will likely be the first one
25 that will be ready for ribbon cutting within your system,

1 because we see a lot of potential synergy with what's
2 beginning to happen within the Wasco community. The
3 support for that is pretty good.

4 I also wanted to point out that building south
5 all the way into Bakersfield we've heard some options, and
6 suggested some options if you can't, but if you could build
7 south all the way into Bakersfield we believe that segment
8 is going to be environmentally ready first. We also
9 believe that that will replace 18 miles of bus travel. And
10 buses can go 55, 45, 55 miles per hour. With a 200-mile-
11 an-hour train that 18-mile segment could save you up to 30
12 minutes on a trip from Southern California to Northern
13 California. And make your early initial operation system
14 much more viable, competitive with vehicle travel, than
15 what you're currently doing.

16 At the other end of the system, building between
17 Gilroy and San Jose, you're trains are going through a
18 heavily urban area. The trains are not going to be able to
19 travel as fast. You're not going to have as much time
20 savings on that. Plus, you have the issue where you're
21 building both electrification of Caltrain along that
22 corridor and you're also building high-speed rail parallel
23 tracks. So you're paying twice for electrification of a
24 train system through that 22-mile or so corridor there. So
25 we recommend that you guys look at possibly an early IOS

1 that would come all the way down in Bakersfield. And begin
2 to leverage the travelers, more than half the State's
3 population from Southern California, into this system. And
4 get back to looking at that basin-to-bay travel, rather
5 than just valley-to-valley. We think that's going to be
6 much more beneficial for your system.

7 So I just want to again thank you for considering
8 these comments. And we look forward to working closely
9 with you on this.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Ball.

11 Richard Chapman followed by Patrick Kelly.

12 MR. CHAPMAN: Good morning Chairman Richard and
13 Members of the Board. My name's Richard Chapman with the
14 presidency of the Kern Economic Development Corporation.

15 And I'm happy today to present a report which
16 I've handed out copies, 10 copies of the Kern County HMF
17 Economic Benefits Analysis. And this research was
18 conducted by the LAEDC's Applied Policy Group. And it just
19 came out this week. I believe this report will show why
20 support -- why the South Valley location for the HMF is
21 preferable.

22 But for your consideration you will be able to
23 look at the economic impact, both the one-time project cost
24 impact on the communities, as well as the on-going
25 considerations. Three to four-thousand jobs in

1 construction, a range up to \$210 million of labor income,
2 \$600 million total input. And again this is, in my
3 opinion, pretty conservative numbers, and \$55 million in
4 tax, local and state tax. And then you go the annual on-
5 going about 3,000 jobs and I won't go into the details.

6 But the main thrust, in addition I think, of the
7 South Valley location is the tie-in to the L.A. Basin.
8 L.A. County, the \$1 trillion economy will also be a partner
9 in terms of providing expertise and potentially workforce.
10 So it's not just a Kern County location, it's actually
11 South Valley as well as L.A. Basin benefit.

12 Kern County right now, is facing significant
13 underemployment and unemployment. You see 11 percent
14 unemployment. It doesn't really tell the story of folks
15 that are underemployed because of low oil prices. And why
16 is this important to the HMF? Because we have ready to go
17 workforce. We talked about ready-to-go sites. We also
18 have ready-to-go-workforce, transferability of skills.

19 Previous discussion mentioned we're number four
20 in STEM jobs. These are STEM workers ready to work in this
21 facility. It's a perfect match and complementary to what I
22 believe the HMF would offer. In addition, Cal State
23 University, Bakersfield is poised to operate the first and
24 only training center for high-speed rail systems in the
25 country right down the road from the prospective sites.

1 So again, at the end of the day, we believe we do
2 offer the most advantages for this type of facility and the
3 best investment that we believe your Board can make. Thank
4 you.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

6 Patrick Kelly, followed by Tom Williams and then
7 Troy Hightower.

8 MR. KELLY: Thank you. Good morning, my name's
9 Patrick Kelly. I'm with Teamsters Local 952 and Teamsters
10 Joint Council 42.

11 I want to congratulate the Commissioners and
12 thank them for their service. It's absolutely vital that
13 this project goes forward. I hope that you can expedite
14 the project between L.A. and Orange County, because we are
15 losing literally thousands of jobs here in Southern
16 California. We were notified a few months ago that Kraft-
17 Heinz is closing their lunchable plant, which has been here
18 for many, many years. We're losing 400 jobs in Fullerton.
19 And there's nothing popping up to replace these jobs.
20 We're facing a loss of manufacturing throughout the State.

21 And it's absolutely essential that our
22 infrastructure be upgraded. You've got a truck driver out
23 there driving a truck that's costing 150, 200 bucks an hour
24 and they're caught in gridlock whether it's on the 5,
25 whether it's on the 405, or whether it's on the 60, all

1 over California. And I'm telling you gloom and doom.
2 We're going to lose hundreds of thousands of jobs in
3 California if this infrastructure piece is not done. And I
4 hope you can figure out a way to expedite it.

5 Maybe we can get some pension funds to help fund
6 part of it or other private investors. But it's absolutely
7 essential for the future of this State and for the work
8 force and younger people that this project go forward and
9 other similar projects like that. It's not just about
10 putting a bunch of construction workers to work. And
11 that's certainly important. It's about preserving
12 manufacturing and distribution jobs here in California.

13 It's so bad here in Orange County that we've lost
14 literally tens of thousands of distribution jobs, just like
15 L.A County has. And we're not going to keep it.
16 Fortunately Vons is moving a bunch of work over to Orange
17 County, so we're going to pick up some jobs, but L.A.
18 County is going to lose hundreds of jobs. And so you've
19 got to look at this in terms -- and I'm talking to
20 everybody -- you've got to look at in terms of managing the
21 variables, managing the risk. To not go forward and to go
22 forward in an expeditious fashion is a travesty.

23 And I know we've got a lot of NIMBYs throughout
24 the State that don't want to do anything. But I'll tell
25 you, you can't have that attitude. It's got to be an

1 attitude, a proactive attitude that not just puts people to
2 work, but keeps people working and develop this State, so
3 people are going to be able to live here and have a good
4 lifestyle for the next 20 years.

5 But anyway thank you everybody for coming and
6 thank you for your service, Commissioners.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Kelly.
8 (Applause.)

9 BOARD MEMBER CORREA: Mr. Chair? Mr. Chair?

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes, go ahead.

11 BOARD MEMBER CORREA: Chairman Richard, I just
12 wanted to thank Mr. Patrick Kelly for making the comments
13 about making suggestions and possible funding sources for
14 the project and being specific.

15 Thank you, Mr. Kelly.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Director.

17 Tom Williams followed by Troy Hightower.

18 Dr. Williams?

19 DR. WILLIAMS: Good morning, Dr. Tom Williams,
20 Sierra Club and Citizens Coalition for a Safe Community.

21 We're just about 50 years too late, but we're
22 getting started now. But are we getting started correctly?
23 I've built tunnels. I've built rail. I've built a lot of
24 things over 45 years with URS Corporation, Parsons
25 Corporation and Dubai Government. A lot of the stuff in

1 Dubai was built under the Dubai Ports Authority, McNeil
2 ((phonetic) and a few others, so I've built things.

3 However, I've also worked with a guy named Carl
4 Sauer who did high-speed rail in Austria. Where did they
5 put them? They couldn't put them on the surface much like
6 Downtown L.A. I helped build the red line Phase 1 subway.

7 Question for the risk for item number three,
8 design and build tunnels. Tunnels need to have a design
9 and build standard approach throughout the State for all
10 California high-speed rail as an alternative, because you
11 may find that it's a lot cheaper to go underground rather
12 than having to negotiate with BNSF and UP Railroad for
13 right-of-way. We had the problem at Union Station. We had
14 five Class Ones there. So put an alternative to every
15 contract, go underground. You can go into to Downtown
16 Bakersfield quite easily underground. On ground it's a
17 little bit more difficult.

18 Then you have the inevitable 2016 Plan. My
19 central issue there is lifecycle cost including replacement
20 long-term maintenance, major maintenance and others. But
21 also here you're trying to get a cheap ride, however will
22 there be the revenues to support it? So overseas, we
23 always had to do life-of-project costs including
24 replacement.

25 We also had to do ability to pay. Will there be

1 enough revenue produced by what you are proposing in the
2 2016 Plan to pay for it. Not just operations and
3 maintenance, but how about finance charges? How about long
4 term, short term maintenance, maintenance, maintenance,
5 because these require a lot of maintenance and a lot of
6 moving parts. So we would highly recommend that you add a
7 economic analysis, economic impact statement, the City of
8 San Jose did that once.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Dr. Williams, thank you for
10 your comments. Thank you.

11 Troy Hightower, followed by Mark Lehner,
12 (phonetic) I'm probably mispronouncing it, I apologize.

13 MR. HIGHTOWER: Good morning Chairman Richard and
14 Members of the Board.

15 I'm not here to make any comment about the
16 Business Plan. My comment is about the ARTIC Center. I
17 ride the train often and this is my first opportunity to
18 see and be a part of the ARTIC Center. And I was very,
19 very impressed. In fact, they have a branch of the Anaheim
20 Public Library and so it gave me a feeling of future. And
21 so I just wanted to thank you for coming to Anaheim and
22 give me an opportunity to see what the future may be.
23 Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Hightower.

25 Sir, is it Mark Lehner?

1 MR. LEHNER: Yeah, well pretty much right.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I apologize.

3 MR. LEHNER: No problem. Chairman Richard, CEO
4 Morales and respective Authority Members, my name is Mark
5 Lehner. I'd like to take advantage of this opportunity to
6 comment on the 2016 Draft Business Plan.

7 Since I was a senior in high school,
8 unfortunately 13 years ago, I have been a follower of this
9 plan of High-Speed Rail Project. I come at this project
10 with a unique point of view and vested interest. I moved
11 to Southern California five years ago from Northern
12 California where I spent the first 26 years of my life. So
13 I look forward to the project in terms of it improving my
14 new home and improving the lifestyle of my former home
15 where most of my family lives.

16 I have a couple of concerns about this plan. One
17 is that in your previous Business Plan, specifically 2014,
18 you mentioned the selling and leasing of a station and air
19 rights around station areas, especially utility corridors
20 along the right-of-way. And this was not mentioned as a
21 possible revenue source in the current Business Plan, or at
22 least I didn't see it, if so it's there I apologize. But
23 that could a potential funding source for the project.

24 Also, in terms of along with that in development
25 of station areas, possibly working with developers and

1 cities to create tax areas where special provisions in
2 property tax could be used to fund the project through new
3 development in the areas.

4 I would also like to comment on Bakersfield along
5 with everyone else, unfortunately for you. I do support
6 Bakersfield's resolution against the temporary station
7 north of Bakersfield. I implore you to make sure that the
8 High-Speed Rail Project does go to Downtown, because that
9 conforms with the Authority's strive for connectivity to
10 other modes and Downtown.

11 I would also comment in terms of early
12 investment. I know that you already have early investment
13 in the current Business Plan, but a couple other things to
14 note for further funding when it comes available. Two big
15 connectors into your project are the Capitol Corridor and
16 Pacific Surfliner. These are currently number two and
17 three in terms of the busiest corridors, in terms of
18 Amtrak. They will be very beneficial in terms of improving
19 those corridors, especially the southern end of the LOSSAN
20 Corridor -- which is currently mostly single-track -- and
21 the current understudied double tracking of the Capitol
22 Corridor from Oakland to San Jose.

23 Also work with your current partners in BART and
24 Caltrain, because they will be the northern end of this
25 section's connectivity to international airports.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Lehner, thank you very
2 much for your comments, sir.

3 Doug Mangione followed by Douglas Robbins and
4 then Alan Nishio.

5 (Colloquy regarding microphones.)

6 MR. MANGIONE: Mr. Chair and Committee Members,
7 my name is Doug Mangione. I represent the International
8 Brotherhood of Electrical Workers here in Orange County.
9 We provide the skilled craft electricians that are going to
10 be working this project. And we look forward to providing
11 those men and women to work on this project.

12 Our sister Local in Fresno, they've experienced
13 very high unemployment in the recession. They have now put
14 100 of men and women into the apprenticeship, especially
15 veterans, giving them the opportunity to work on Phase 1 of
16 this project. It's been a boon to that Local and a boon to
17 the local economy. It's going give these folks a good
18 start in a career in construction.

19 The other item here: I traveled to Europe, I've
20 ridden the TGV, I've ridden the high-speed rails there.
21 They're very efficient. They're very good. I think
22 California needs to be the leader in this country, to
23 provide the leadership to move forward and provide the
24 first high-speed rail in the country. And we've always led
25 this country in innovation. And we should not stop. We

1 should continue to do that.

2 This will be with parts made locally here in
3 California and in America. It'll provide local hire for
4 Californians to do the work. And it'll provide a great
5 means of transportation up into Yosemite, up into
6 Sacramento, up to Fresno and to San Francisco. It's going
7 to be a boom to that Central Valley. And let's get started
8 on it and keep it moving. Thank you. (Applause.)

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Mangione.

10 Douglas Robbins followed by Alan Nishio.

11 MR. ROBBINS: Good morning, my name is Douglas
12 Robbins. I represent the Painters and Allied Trades
13 District Council --

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Robbins, you may have to
15 pull the --

16 MR. ROBBINS: Microphone?

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Your voice doesn't seem to be
18 quite as loud as Mr. Mangione's, so I don't want to pit the
19 painters and the electrician guys against each other.
20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. ROBBINS: No, I don't want to compete with
22 him with the voice. All right, thank you. Anyway like I
23 said, I represent the Painters and Allied Trades District
24 Council 36. I'm here today to show support for the high-
25 speed rail.

1 As more and more people are moving to California
2 to escape the harsh winters in the central and eastern
3 states the commuters are being choked down on the roadways
4 with long commute times, record commute times, spending
5 countless hours of their time commuting, reducing their
6 quality of life. And although we were making many
7 improvements locally by adding light rail systems,
8 expanding freeways and interchanges to increase the traffic
9 flow, it doesn't address commutes between major cities
10 throughout California.

11 And so I believe the high-speed rail is an answer
12 to the problem and is essential to California's growth and
13 quality of life for California residents. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

15 Alan Nishio followed by Ernesto Medrano.

16 MR. NISHIO: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board,
17 first I apologize. I filled out the wrong color of card,
18 but my comments will be brief. I'm speaking about the
19 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis for the Burbank to Los
20 Angeles.

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay.

22 MR. HISHIO: I'm representing the Little Tokyo
23 Community Council, which is a stakeholder organization of
24 over 90 groups representing Los Angeles Little Tokyo,
25 that's committed to maintaining the viable history and

1 cultural community in Downtown Los Angeles. We want to
2 express the support for the California High-Speed Rail
3 Project and particularly the alignment that's been adopted
4 moving out of Union Station toward Anaheim.

5 The S Curve Alignment is one that we feel does
6 benefit both logistically cost-wise, as well as the impact
7 on our community. An early option that was considered was
8 a diagonal alignment that would have crossed right over two
9 very important historic cultural assets within our
10 community: Fukui Mortuary and Nishi Hongwanji Buddhist
11 Temple.

12 The Fukui Mortuary, while it's a mortuary, is
13 over 100 years old. It's a fifth-generation operated
14 mortuary that provides services as well as funeral support
15 for members of our Japanese-American community for many
16 years. And the high-speed rail would be moving right over
17 where they're located currently, if the diagonal alignment
18 would have been considered.

19 The other important historic institution is the
20 Nishi Hongwanji Buddhist Temple, which was founded in 1905,
21 which is our largest and oldest Japanese-American Buddhist
22 Temple in the United States. And so we appreciated the
23 staff's work to ensure that an alignment would be adopted
24 that would not significantly impact those two important
25 institutions.

1 Little Tokyo is a 130-year old historic
2 community, one of the oldest in Los Angeles. This is one
3 of only three remaining Japan towns in the nation, but
4 prior to World War II there were over 100. There are three
5 remaining: San Francisco, Los Angeles and San Jose. We
6 consider this a historic national treasure and appreciate
7 the sensitivity and support of the High-Speed Rail in their
8 design alternatives. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much, sir.
10 (Applause.)

11 Ernesto Medrano followed by Ray Angon.

12 MR. MEDRANO: Good morning and my name is Ernesto
13 Medrano. I represent the Los Angeles and Orange County
14 Building and Construction Trades Council, representing over
15 140,000 men and women. Welcome to Anaheim. I'm also an
16 Anaheim resident, so I'm excited to see you here. I
17 couldn't be any more excited to see this body here today.
18 I had the opportunity to serve on the Stakeholders Group
19 last week. And I want to give kudos to the staff for a
20 great job that was done.

21 I do want to urge one thing on that and that is
22 we need -- and I don't see a lot of them in the room -- but
23 we need to get some millennials in the room and involved.
24 They're going to own this transportation system. They're
25 going to ride it and they're going to want to leave a

1 legacy to their children in the future. So we've really
2 got to make an effort to outreach to the young men and
3 women who are millennials, because they're the ones that
4 are really brought into this thing.

5 This has all of the ingredients of an industrial
6 policy. And I'm really excited to see that. We don't make
7 cars anymore. We don't make airplanes anymore. These are
8 the high-skill, high-wage jobs. It's construction. It's
9 still a lot of the jobs that Brother Patrick Kelly
10 mentioned. It's a lot of the work in the utility side and
11 servicing these trains are going to be very important.

12 And I'm very excited about the Buy American, Buy
13 Californian-made products here, because that is what it is
14 all about, is putting our folks to work and making this a
15 very viable economy.

16 We have to be thinking like what President
17 Roosevelt was thinking when he built the bridges. We have
18 to be thinking about what President Eisenhower was thinking
19 when he built the highway system. And we've got to be
20 thinking about what Governor Pat Brown was thinking when he
21 built the water infrastructure in the State. We can't
22 think about today. We've got to be thinking about 50
23 years, 75 years, or 100 years down the road this is our
24 legacy. This is an historic project that we're very
25 excited about.

1 Other industrialized nations, and I know we're
2 the eighth top in the economy, have this already. We are
3 behind the eight ball, but we're going to catch up and I
4 hope that we can continue to do that.

5 We want to offer our opportunity to partner with
6 you, whether it's working with the community, whether it's
7 as mentioned earlier through a trust fund to provide for
8 funding for this endeavor, because we think it's a very,
9 very -- it's a great project. And there's just nothing
10 like it in this country. This is a top-notch project.

11 Does it have its challenges? Yes, but we've got
12 to be able to overcome those challenges. So on behalf of
13 the men and women of the Building and Construction Trades
14 Council we're ready to start building this baby. Thank
15 you. (Applause.)

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Medrano.

17 Ray Angon followed by, I think, it's Kacey
18 Auston. I hope I have that correctly.

19 And I hope I pronounced your name correctly, sir.

20 MR. ANGON: Yes sir. I'm Ran Angon with the
21 Plumbers/Steamfitters Orange County. I represent over 800
22 members. We're also part of the Building Trades. And I
23 want to welcome you to Orange County.

24 We are excited about having this completion
25 coming through. I'd like to be able to ride one

1 of those trains and we know it takes time. We know that
2 building out here does take time. Look what happened with
3 the 91 Freeway. I remember when the 91 Freeway was just a
4 dead end. We had dirt roads coming out to Knott's Berry
5 Farm. Orange County was way far from L.A. County. Now
6 we're just like a hop, skip and a jump to that area. Also,
7 the 605 Freeway, we had homes where people moved out, so
8 that they could be extending the freeway and that took a
9 long time. I was glad to see that it was finally
10 completed.

11 And I'm looking forward to having this also going
12 on in all of California and to be able to ride that. I
13 want to thank you for the opportunity to speak. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir. (Applause.)

15 Is it -- did I pronounce that --

16 MS. AUSTON: Kacey Auston, that's right.

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Kacey Auston from Chowchilla.

18 MS. AUSTON: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning, ma'am.

20 MS. AUSTON: Good morning. My name is Kacey
21 Auston, I am representing the City of Chowchilla. I have
22 been asked on to be their consultant on these issues. And
23 I just want to introduce myself to each and every one of
24 you. I will be reaching out to each of you individually
25 hoping that you can find time in your schedules to meet

1 with me. Chair Member Richards, Tom Richards has been kind
2 enough to meet with me, as well as Mr. Morales. And I do
3 thank you both for that.

4 Since 2010 Chowchilla has supported the alignment
5 along Avenue 21 and other routes that would not -- excuse
6 me -- since 2010 it has been in support of the right-of-way
7 of Avenue 21, as well as the Chamber of Commerce. And it's
8 no secret that the relationship with High-Speed Rail and
9 the City of Chowchilla has been tense. But the history is
10 exactly what it is, is history.

11 And so I'm asking you again that we sit down and
12 we discuss what is in the best interests of high-speed rail
13 and the City of Chowchilla and minimize the effects of an
14 already impoverished community. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Auston.

16 Laurie Hunter followed by Fran Inman and then
17 Marvin Dean.

18 Thank you. Go ahead, Ms. Hunter.

19 MS. HUNTER: Thank you. I'm Laurie Hunter. I
20 work for the High Desert Corridor Joint Powers Authority.
21 And the High Desert Corridor is the orange line on the map
22 that you see there. It has a high-speed rail connector
23 between the station in Palmdale, the station in
24 Victorville. It connects with XpressWest's line that goes
25 up to Vegas.

1 And so I'm here to give you a status report. We
2 had started an investment grade ridership and revenue study
3 for the line that included high-speed rail. It's helped.
4 As a matter of fact, funding is being provided by SANDAG,
5 the JPA, XpressWest and your agency, California High-speed
6 Rail Authority, to do this investment grade ridership and
7 revenue study, to determine by connecting high-speed rail
8 that you're developing up with the XpressWest line, to see
9 what kind of revenue that we can expect to build the High
10 Desert Corridor and XpressWest portions and what it can
11 contribute financially to California High-Speed Rail.

12 That study was begun in February and we expect it
13 to be done in June 30th. And it will, I think show, that
14 what FRA's study initially on a nationwide high-speed rail
15 regional network has shown, is that the Las Vegas to Los
16 Angeles market is the most profitable market in the nation
17 for high-speed rail.

18 So it could be a way to add to the revenue of
19 your Business Plan, so we're asking you to hold open your
20 attitude and see if maybe we can join Northern California,
21 Southern California to go and seek revenue to be able to
22 have an interim solution by using Metrolink, a blended
23 solution, until your Business Plan -- to come down for
24 Bakersfield -- is done between Palmdale and Burbank, to use
25 Metrolink in an interim. You'd have to transfer from a

1 Burbank to a Palmdale station to go over the High Desert
2 Corridor and up to Las Vegas. But it could be a way to
3 prove to the public that high-speed rail is popular, people
4 are going to ride it and that there's enough money to use
5 for construction, operation and maintenance financing.

6 The market in Southern California is the reason I
7 think that the nine million people in the Los Angeles area,
8 the two million people in Las Vegas could connect into your
9 line, go north and south.

10 Also, the other thing I wanted to point out, our
11 EIS for the High Desert Corridor is due out in final form
12 in two weeks. And we worked during that EIS with your
13 engineers and XpressWest engineers on a wye intersection so
14 you can have a smooth, nontransferrable one-seat ride from
15 Las Vegas all the way up to San Francisco and all the way
16 down to San Diego eventually.

17 So anyway, we'll keep in touch with your staff
18 with that study. And hopefully you'll look forward to
19 giving some thought of using that revenue.

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much,
21 Ms. Hunter. I appreciate that.

22 Fran Inman, a friend of ours. And Ms. Inman is
23 not only with Majestic Realty, but is one of the State's
24 leading lights on the goods movements problem that we have
25 from our ports, so Ms. Inman, welcome.

1 MS. INMAN: Well, good morning, Chair Richards
2 and Members of the Board, great to be here and welcome to
3 the O.C. Believe it or not this is what I call home, so
4 even though I spend a lot of time --

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: We only see you in Sacramento.

6 MS. INMAN: -- elsewhere, but delighted to hear
7 the other colleagues today bring up the importance of goods
8 movement. And I know you all are focused on a task, but I
9 would argue that we're all in this together. And we all
10 operate on system of systems.

11 And this region is really, as you all know,
12 ground zero for our goods movement. We are all working
13 under the Governor's Executive Order to reduce our
14 emissions from the transportation sector and goods
15 movement. And at the same time, Mike Rossi and I are
16 spending a lot of time with our colleagues figuring out how
17 we're going to fulfill that wish to increase our
18 competitiveness.

19 So I think it really is so important for all of
20 us as we look at these, and really holistic system of
21 systems manners. And our Regional RTP for the SCAG Region
22 just told us that we spend three billion hours stuck in
23 gridlock already. And I feel like I do my share as well as
24 many others around here, so I think it really is important.
25 I want to commend you. I realized the devil's always in

1 the details and we have to work together and work through
2 all of those. But I would encourage all of you to pay a
3 little attention to the goods movement sector and the jobs.
4 A third of our jobs in our State relate directly or
5 indirectly to the supply chain.

6 The National Freight Strategic Plan that is out
7 in draft form -- Bonnie Lowenthal and I had the honor of
8 serving on the National Freight Advisory Committee, so we
9 do have recognition from our friends in Washington how
10 vibrant this corridor is, but we're going to have to
11 leaning in and keep leading. So as we try to green our
12 supply chain we'll be trying to put more and more goods on
13 to our rail partners, I think. And that's a challenge for
14 all of us as we looked at not just we like to talk a lot
15 about our trade corridors, but I call them efficiency
16 corridors. And I think the high-speed rail can be part of
17 our efficiency corridor solutions whether we're moving the
18 people or the goods.

19 So thank you all for your commitment and happy to
20 take the High-Speed Rail on any port tours or any
21 distribution center tours, because I think we all do need
22 to learn from each other. And like I said we're trying to
23 increase our competitiveness in that sector, so it's very
24 important.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thanks very much, Ms. Inman.

1 Thank you.

2 Marvin Dean followed by Keith Harkey.

3 Good morning, Mr. Dean.

4 MR. DEAN: Good morning, Board Members. I'm going
5 to be very brief.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Marvin, I think you're going
7 to have to pick that up.

8 MR. DEAN: Pick that up? Okay, I'm going to
9 speak briefly on four items. Two items I've given a hand
10 out on. First of all, I want to say I'm here representing
11 the Kern County Minority Contractors Association out of
12 Bakersfield. We represent subcontractors, WBE
13 subcontractors, small business and also the environmental
14 justice community.

15 I want to start off with a well thank you for
16 having such a staff person such as Michelle Bowman (sic:
17 Boehm), because she's doing an excellent job with her
18 taskforce she put together from Bakersfield to Palmdale.
19 She created a community group that brought all the sites
20 together to make sure early on in the process all the
21 voices are involved in this process, so there will not be a
22 lot of opposition. And I think that ought to -- a model
23 that you ought to use in these other regions. She's doing
24 a really excellent job and so I want to commend her. I
25 think when people are doing a good job they need to be

1 public acknowledged. She didn't ask for that. I just want
2 to give it to her.

3 The second thing I want to talk about is this --
4 a decision the Board has made to go north instead of going
5 south in the Business Plan. I would say that a lot of that
6 has probably been on our community, Bakersfield, by -- and
7 I tell I know there's a lot of Bakersfield here now, but
8 we've been behind the curve. Instead of working in good
9 faith with this Board and the staff we've been fighting in
10 lawsuits and all the other things. And I've been
11 championing this project for the longest in saying that
12 we've got to get on a local initiative to work partnership
13 with the Authority.

14 And I think a lot things will happen, because you
15 guys have a deadline to get this project built. So but the
16 only thing I would say is that you try to find a way to
17 come into Bakersfield Downtown proper instead of having
18 that temporary station out in the middle of nowhere. I'm
19 sure some of the other members talked about that, because
20 then we've got to look at how we're going to connect from
21 Bakersfield to the station. And it may be years away
22 before we go south, so if there's some kind of way we can
23 come into Bakersfield I think that'd be a big help to those
24 us that are disappointed it's going to go north instead of
25 south.

1 Now the two things I handed out, and I want to
2 speak to very briefly, is some of you know that I've been
3 speaking -- first of all I want to be very clear. We
4 support this project. You probably have no stronger
5 advocate to support this project, bar none, in Bakersfield.
6 I've been doing this for years from the start of this
7 project. But there are some real concerns that we have and
8 I'm a part of a taskforce that is looking at this
9 environmental justice issue.

10 And I'm giving you a handout. It's a talking
11 point. The person that was going to be here from San
12 Francisco, our consultant, was going to make this
13 presentation. But about midnight she emailed me some
14 talking points. I won't go through it. It's all outlined
15 here. But we're saying that something needs to be done,
16 because there's a gap right now between the Small Business
17 Program and even the Community Benefit Program that a lot
18 of these smaller communities -- primarily along the
19 corridor, these environmental justice communities --
20 they're being left out of the process. And I'm hearing it
21 every day. I'm championing the project. I'm saying it's
22 coming, give us time.

23 And I think when I met some of you -- when I
24 first met Jeff -- I think you were at RFAA (phonetic) --
25 there was a group that talked about that environmental

1 justice. I said, "We don't want to stop this project,
2 because of that." But I'm telling you if we don't address
3 that concern there's going to be potentially somebody
4 bringing litigation on that. And you're going to find a
5 lot of your friends that support the project may join into
6 that, because they feel like they're being left out of the
7 process. So I'm trying to say we want to do something
8 about it. And we want to work with this Board and work
9 with staff to come in order to come in with some solutions.
10 We think we can do that, but we've got to pay attention to
11 it.

12 Then the last thing I'm going to say and I'll
13 close, and I know the buzzer just went off --

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

15 MR. DEAN: -- I don't know how clear this is, but
16 I understand that you're going to be in Bakersfield on May
17 10th. That just so happens to be -- if it is -- I don't
18 know if it is. I got a flyer there in front of you,
19 because what we're doing -- that just happened to line up
20 with our 9th Annual Public Contracting Expo.

21 So what we tried to do if you are going to be
22 there what we're doing is we're working with the business
23 community, our elected officials, and the community at
24 level. And we want to put together after the Board Meeting
25 and all that, before you all get out of town, we want to

1 have a reception meet-n-greet with the community. So we
2 can set up and build good will.

3 And we formed a group called the San Joaquin
4 Valley High-Speed Rail Association that is basically to
5 give information, advocacy, and that type of things. So I
6 just want to say that we welcome you. And help us support
7 you and help us help you on the ground where's there a lot
8 of misinformation and a lot of opposition.

9 So thank you for the extra moments.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Dean.

11 Keith Harkey, good morning sir.

12 MR. HARKEY: Good morning. My name's Keith
13 Harkey. I represent about 5,000 members of Ironworkers
14 Local 433. Our training facility is right here in Orange
15 County.

16 We're anxious to get this going, bottom line.
17 Right now we have over a 1,000 people -- 1,000 young men
18 and women, veterans that are changing their lives through
19 our apprenticeship program -- with well paid jobs. So
20 we're looking forward to getting this going.

21 I'd like to thank your foresight in bringing this
22 all the way down to Orange County and looking forward to
23 going into San Diego, hopefully. The United States is
24 looking at the high-speed rail as an alternative. We know
25 where that's moving forward. We like to be, like we said,

1 leaders.

2 This is not going to be something like the 91-15
3 Exchange where as soon as it's open it's already
4 overbooked. This will never be outgrown, this is going to
5 continue to move forward, move California. Mr. Kelly spoke
6 on it. Right now we're getting choked out as far as
7 transportation and moving goods and services. When that
8 happens then people look for somewhere else to go to be
9 more productive.

10 Also, as Mr. Medrano spoke on, it's about putting
11 people to work. When people are working they have extra
12 money. When people have extra money they move around.
13 When people move around they spend money. And with that I
14 do close. Thank you very much.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

16 With that we've completed the public comments
17 submitted for Session I, which address the items two
18 through five, but primarily the Business Plan.

19 And before we move on I just want to assure
20 everybody that the Business Plan was produced as a draft,
21 specifically to afford opportunity for the public to
22 comment. It may shock people to know that we don't
23 consider ourselves the fount of all wisdom and so your
24 comments and your input and your thoughts and your
25 critiques are very important to us. And they will be and

1 they are being taken seriously, so I want to thank
2 everybody again for taking time to come and comment on the
3 Business Plan and the other items.

4 And with that I will now move through items two
5 through five, before we proceed to the next public comment
6 session on the environmental documents. So I'll turn to
7 item two, which are the minutes of the last meeting.

8 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: So moved.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: And it's been moved by Mr.
10 Rossi.

11 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Seconded by Vice Chair
12 Richards. Will the Secretary please call the roll?

13 MS. HARLAN: Vice Chair Richards?

14 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.

15 MS. HARLAN: Director Rossi?

16 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yes.

17 MS. HARLAN: Director Correa?

18 BOARD MEMBER CORREA: Yes.

19 MS. HARLAN: Director Curtin?

20 BOARD MEMBER CURTIN:

21 MS. HARLAN: Director Paskett?

22 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: Abstained.

23 MS. HARLAN: Director Lowenthal?

24 BOARD MEMBER LOWENTHAL: Yes.

25 MS. HARLAN: Chair Richard?

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

2 Before we move to item three, I have one
3 announcement that I think people will like, which is just
4 to remind people that if you have parking validation for
5 Car Park 2, check in at the document table, because there's
6 some discount or validation for that that we can offer. So
7 your comments are not as expensive as you thought they
8 were, and there's an opportunity to save a little money.

9 Also, before we turn to the rest of the agenda
10 last night there was a publicly noticed closed session of
11 the Board. We recessed that until today, but for the
12 closed session last night there were no action items to
13 report.

14 The next item is item three, to consider adopting
15 a risk-informed contingency for Construction Package 4 of
16 the design-build contract. Mr. Tapping, good morning.

17 MR. TAPPING: Good morning, Chairman Richard, and
18 Board Members. I'm happy to be here today. My name is Jon
19 Tapping. I'm the Director of Risk Management and Project
20 Controls for the Authority. I'm here before you today to
21 present an approval item and that is the risk-informed
22 contingency for Construction Package 4.

23 In 2013 the Board approved a resolution that
24 provided for contingency management for design-build
25 construction. The analysis that we performed, and the

1 recommendation herein, is consistent with the resolution
2 that was approved by the Board. The risk-informed analysis
3 approach that we undertook is similar to the one we took
4 for CP1 and CP2-3 at past Board meetings.

5 By way of background a contingency is basically a
6 level of protection to protect project budget that allows
7 for successful completion in the face of uncertainty and
8 risk. It is standard design-build process, and it is
9 accounted for in the project and program budgets.

10 Contingency is managed by the Authority and our
11 contingency risk analysis is continually updated to assess
12 the appropriateness of the contingency as risks are either
13 retired or realized or mitigated.

14 In January 2016, the Board approved Construction
15 Rail Builders as the best value proposers for CP4 contract.
16 And the CP4 contract was subsequently executed in February
17 2016 in accordance with the resolution. Noting that the
18 contingency recommendation would follow the approval and
19 execution of the contract, which is why I'm here today.

20 So basically a little summary of what we do when
21 we do a risk-informed analysis. It's a quite comprehensive
22 analysis. We look at all the risks on the project and the
23 program, which might affect the project. We do it in a
24 workshop setting. We get all the functional experts within
25 the Authority and other stakeholders involved in assessing

1 those risks, determining a probability and impact of those
2 risks.

3 And then what we do is run it through a
4 simulation called a Monte Carlo Analysis, which is a
5 tremendously powerful tool, which allows you to basically
6 conclude a range of possible outcomes when you consider all
7 the risks taken together in terms of cost and schedule.

8 Some of the risk drivers for this project were
9 similar to some of the other CP contracts. We look at
10 stakeholder and third-party coordination issues, which have
11 the propensity to offer schedule risk to the contract. In
12 this particular contract, differing site conditions and
13 subsurface conditions, which may materially differ from
14 those represented are ordinarily accounted, issues such as
15 utilities, unknown utilities that are located. We also
16 looked at businesses in the area and there's certain
17 contract provisions, which provide for coordination with
18 the businesses. And so there's a coordination effort there
19 that has some uncertainty associated with it.

20 So those are some of the risk drivers for this
21 particular project. We ran through the analysis, ran the
22 Monte Carlo Analysis, and the conclusions basically
23 represented a potential range of outcomes and costs for the
24 contingency.

25 One of the things that is ongoing and will be

1 presented at a future board meeting is the uncertainty
2 around the provisional sum included in the contract. It's
3 been excluded from the contract and it has to do with PG&E,
4 AT&T, and Level 3 Utilities in the coordination. Estimates
5 for that work are ongoing and a risk overlay for that work
6 is also ongoing. We've been working closely with the
7 Finance and Audit Committee on that work and plan to
8 present it in May.

9 The recommendation is to allocate 62 million,
10 which is a 90 percent confidence level as you look at the
11 output of the analysis. And basically, what that means is
12 we have a 90 percent confidence level that \$62 million will
13 be an appropriate contingency for this particular contract.
14 This is consistent with the risk tolerance. We used a 90
15 percent on CP2-3 as well.

16 I'd like to stress that the allocation of 62
17 million will come from unallocated program contingency. it
18 is not a budget change and it was in cost projections,
19 current cost projections.

20 So with that I'd like -- the recommendation is to
21 allocate 62 million for the contingency for CP4. At this
22 point I'll take any questions.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Before we do, Mr.
24 Morales wanted to make a clarification, and then Ms.
25 Paskett asked first and then Ms. Lowenthal.

1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: I just want to
2 expand on the point that Jon made at the end. We have in
3 the Phase 1 Budget a total of \$10.9 billion, almost 11
4 billion of contingency, overall. That's the combination of
5 allocated and unallocated contingency applied across the
6 whole program. And so what we do in this process then is
7 take parts of that contingency and apply it against
8 specific contracts and so I just wanted to reinforce that
9 the total amount is budgeted within the program. And this
10 is just the allocation to the contract.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Director Paskett?

12 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: I have a question
13 regarding the amount that's not included, so actually there
14 are two questions related to that. Why isn't it included
15 and you stated there isn't a cost estimate for those
16 amounts not included, and is there at least a guestimate
17 that you can share with us?

18 MR. TAPPING: Yes. It's not included, because
19 initially this work is not in the CP contract. It's what
20 we call excluded work. There are separate agreements with
21 these agencies PG&E, AT&T and Level 3. And we're looking
22 at a more comprehensive approach of looking at all the
23 third-party utilities. This is some work we've been doing
24 with the Finance and Audit Committee and so we are updating
25 the analysis and we --

1 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: Well, why -- just to
2 interrupt you, why is that? Because it sounds like you're
3 trying to do an approach and there's an amount that you
4 come up with your Monte Carlo Analysis that you can present
5 to us and the public.

6 MR. TAPPING: Right.

7 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: And so why aren't those
8 entities included and is there someone different managing
9 that versus them? What's the strategy behind excluding
10 them?

11 MR. TAPPING: The design-builder yes, will not be
12 managing these particular contracts. They're managed by
13 the Authority outside of the design-builder contracts.

14 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: Why is that?

15 MR. TAPPING: During the procurement process when
16 you start -- look at allocating risk there was, as is the
17 nature with utility work, there's a considerable amount of
18 uncertainty very early on if you haven't done a lot of
19 exploratory borings. And so there was a lot of uncertainty
20 there and during the procurement process the most efficient
21 risk in terms of weighing a bid where a contractor would
22 bid that amount versus separating it as a provisional sum,
23 it was the most appropriate risk transfer to separate it
24 out.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Maybe I can just add something

1 if Ms. Lowenthal will just yield for a moment?

2 I think what Mr. Tapping is saying is it's about
3 risk balancing and we've seen this on all our contracts.
4 So if we're saying that we're going to build a certain
5 segment from X to Y, then we go out and we tell the
6 contractor that we want them to build that and to do all
7 the things necessary to do that including moving the
8 utilities, and if there's substantial uncertainty about the
9 cost of moving the utilities. Because I know this will
10 shock you but for example, PG&E doesn't necessarily know
11 where all its lines are and so -- Ms. Paskett and I have
12 some history there. So the contractor would then price
13 that risk, because they wouldn't know what they'd be
14 dealing with.

15 So what the staff has done, they've said for that
16 segment from X to Y we want the contractor to do the civil
17 works. We're going -- our budget for X to Y includes all
18 this, but we're pulling this away from the design-build
19 contractor, because they would price that risk too high.
20 And it's better for us to deal with that risk separately.

21 So that's why the program budget for this portion
22 covers both the 327 million and the extra amount that's out
23 there to see what we're going to need once we see what it
24 takes to actually move those utilities. This contingency
25 then, is against that part of the contract that the design-

1 build contractor has a responsibility for. Not the piece
2 that we've held back that we have responsibility for.

3 I hope that's clear.

4 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: I had a feeling that would
5 be the answer. And so my second part of the question is,
6 and maybe I'll add a little bit more to that, I encourage
7 if we're managing that directly and it's a risk that's
8 unknown, because there's some uncertainty with respect to
9 where the utility relocation is, because their information
10 is maybe not as accurate as they'd like it to be.

11 If we're taking that risk on I'd like you to
12 report back to us separately on your status of managing
13 that risk with those utilities. And I would encourage you
14 to be assertive in your efforts to ensure the utilities
15 hold up their end of the bargain to keep the costs to a
16 minimum.

17 As you're looking through this -- and maybe you
18 can tell me, "Commissioner, I don't have the answer for you
19 today," and that's okay -- but as you're looking through
20 this and it's segregated out from the amount of money that
21 we're seeing, which is in the budget what is the estimated
22 risk because of the uncertainty with this stakeholder group
23 that we may -- the cost exposure that we may be exposed to?

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yeah. And Jon, of course, is
25 just the guy who's analyzing the risk. We have other

1 people who are managing the relationship with the
2 utilities.

3 Vice Chair Richards wanted to add one thing.

4 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: I think a couple of things,
5 Mr. Chairman, but first is this on? I think it is.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yeah.

7 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: The first thing that it
8 does also is by doing it this way, it gives the Authority
9 and the entire project the ability to move forward in a
10 more timely way. Because as we all know when we actually
11 enter into these construction-phase projects it's up to the
12 contractor to actually do the design. So it moves the
13 project forward. It helps with the expenditure of the
14 obligations on the federal funds.

15 With regards to the provisional sums in the
16 contracts that Jon Tapping has mentioned, it also gives the
17 Authority -- and with a process that we've got ongoing
18 internally with staff members who are specifically involved
19 in, and responsible for the accurate as much as possible
20 definition of what the exposures are in the third-party
21 agreements.

22 They're much more difficult to deal with, because
23 they aren't a portion of the project that we are actually
24 involved in the development or construction of ourselves.
25 And as the Chairman indicated, specifically with PG&E, but

1 it's not uncommon with the other third-party agreement
2 providers, that there are uncertainties that we're involved
3 in that take a complete different tack towards trying to
4 estimate what the actual costs are.

5 And I think what we are in the process of doing
6 also is -- Chair Rossi of the F and A Committee has
7 required or requested and required a full update on third-
8 party agreements at our May F and A meeting, which will
9 later be reported out to the Board.

10 So I think there will be a lot more clarity
11 coming to this Board in the next two months.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Director Lowenthal has been
13 very patient, thank you for that.

14 BOARD MEMBER LOWENTHAL: No problem, thank you.

15 I just want to say as a former member of the
16 Legislature and the Chair of the Transportation Committee,
17 the most important issue that was brought up repeatedly
18 about high-speed rail was in fact, to provide risk
19 management. I think you have done that with a 90 percent
20 certainty and I'm really pleased with your work, Jon. So
21 I'm very happy to support this.

22 MR. TAPPING: Thanks, that makes my day.

23 BOARD MEMBER LOWENTHAL: And I think it's
24 important that we listen to the Legislature and keep that
25 relationship going.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: And it turns out that Director
2 Lowenthal actually has some very substantive background in
3 this area and started asking very detailed questions of Mr.
4 Tapping in the very first meeting. So she understands
5 statistical analysis and risk assessment, which is yet
6 another benefit of having her here.

7 MR. TAPPING: And that was amusing, because I was
8 briefed, "Don't talk to her about Monte Carlo, you know,
9 don't." And all of a sudden she starts talking to me about
10 mathematical models and --

11 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: It was because we knew she
12 knew more than us.

13 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Jon, could you just tell
14 me --

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Pull the mic close.

16 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Could you just tell us
17 what's the percentage here?

18 MR. TAPPING: Fourteen percent of the fixed bid
19 amount.

20 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Fourteen on fixed?

21 MR. TAPPING: Yeah.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. My math must be wrong,
23 because I got 16 percent.

24 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Your math's wrong.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. (Laughter)

1 Well, I added the 62 and the 337 and then I
2 divided 62 into the 389 and I got 16 percent. Anyway --

3 MR. TAPPING: Yeah, I can't do that in my head
4 right now, but we'll talk offline.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Well, I can't either but okay.
6 (Laughter.)

7 MR. TAPPING: It is, Mike, quite similar to CP2-3
8 in CP4 --

9 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: That's what I'm
10 (indiscernible) --

11 MR. TAPPING: In fact, it's a little bit lower.

12 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Well, that's All right. As
13 you look at it, it would -- I would have said 16 off the
14 top of my head, but as I looked at it, it looked like it
15 was a little bit lower than what we (indiscernible) --

16 MR. TAPPING: Yes, it is.

17 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: If you're comfortable with
18 that predicated on what you've analyzed?

19 MR. TAPPING: Yes. Yes.

20 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Any other questions or
22 comments?

23 BOARD MEMBER LOWENTHAL: I'll make a motion to
24 support the resolution.

25 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: I second.

1 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. It was moved by
3 Director Lowenthal and seconded by Member Paskett and by
4 Member Rossi.

5 If you could call the roll, please?

6 MS. HARLAN: Vice Chair Richards?

7 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.

8 MS. HARLAN: Director Rossi?

9 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yes.

10 MS. HARLAN: Director Correa?

11 BOARD MEMBER CORREA: Yes.

12 MS. HARLAN: Director Curtin?

13 BOARD MEMBER CURTIN: Yes.

14 MS. HARLAN: Director Paskett?

15 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: Yes.

16 MS. HARLAN: Director Lowenthal?

17 BOARD MEMBER LOWENTHAL: Yes.

18 MS. HARLAN: Chair Richard?

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

20 Thank you, Mr. Tapping.

21 Okay. Next is item four, consider delegating
22 authority to negotiate and finalize agreements with the
23 Burlington Northern Santa Fe BNSF Railway.

24 I don't see Mr. Vacca, so you must be
25 Mr. Fellenz?

1 MR. FELLEENZ: Yes, Mr. Fellenz, Chief Counsel for
2 High-Speed Rail. Mr. Chairman, Board Members, and Mr.
3 Morales I'm here to present this item although Frank Vacca
4 was quite involved in this and he'll prepare the memo. And
5 he and I both have been working on these BNSF agreements
6 for quite some time, getting them very close to being able
7 to be executed with your approval.

8 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Before you go on, Tom, Mr.
9 Chairman can I --

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Please pull the mic close,
11 Michael. I'm sorry, but your words are important, we want
12 everybody to hear them.

13 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I don't know about that, but
14 look I appreciate Tom making this presentation. Mr. Vacca
15 should be here making this presentation.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Do you want to respond?

17 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Sure. I made
18 that decision based on just economizing the travel time and
19 the efficiency of having staff here. Tom's been directly
20 involved in the negotiations of the agreements with the
21 BNSF as well. And so it was really just a matter of
22 economizing the travel given that we're offsite today.

23 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: And I would suggest that
24 that's not an economy worth talking about and the senior
25 guy needs to be here, because it's his thing. He should

1 have been here.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Are we time sensitive on this?

3 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: We are. We are, Mr.
4 Chairman.

5 MR. FELLEENZ: Yes.

6 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I know we are. I'm
7 suggesting we go forward, but I just (indiscernible) --

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay, Vice Chair Richards?

9 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes, if I may, Mr.
10 Chairman? This somewhat relates to my comment on the last
11 agenda item with regards to the importance of these third-
12 party agreements and the implications that they have on
13 moving the project forward.

14 In this instance, and as I think those who have
15 been involved -- it's a very difficult process we've
16 learned or at least those of us who haven't been involved
17 in this sort of thing before -- in actually putting
18 together the agreements with the railroads. In this
19 instance, this work has been ongoing for some period of
20 time. It basically came to light in the last couple of
21 weeks that it appeared that we were in a position to move
22 forward on this item.

23 The challenge is, of course, that we didn't have
24 a longer period of time to review it as Board Members. But
25 what I would say is that I did have an opportunity to, as a

1 result of some of the things that the Chair had asked me to
2 do with regards to getting involved in looking at third-
3 party agreements. I have reviewed the information that was
4 presented, did have some opportunity to look at the initial
5 draft, to ask a number of questions, to have worked very
6 closely with the staff member who has been charged with the
7 responsibility for the oversight of third-party agreements.

8 And I can say that from the participation in
9 this and other third-party negotiations or agreements, I
10 feel that the information that we have in making this
11 decision today is as complete, if not more so, than the
12 other third-party agreements that I've looked at. And
13 because the importance of not slowing the down the
14 construction in CP1 -- or primarily in this instance 2, 3
15 and 4 -- I think that it's important for us to listen to
16 the presentation and if comfortable to act on this today,
17 because it does construction scheduling implications.

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Why don't you proceed,
19 Mr. Fellenz?

20 MR. FELLEENZ: Oh, thank you.

21 I just want to start out with some background
22 regarding the alignments for the route through Northern
23 Santa Fe Railway and the Central Valley. And this is
24 through CP1, 2, 3 and 4. Proposition 1A has a requirement
25 that says to reduce impacts on communities and the

1 environment, the alignment for the high-speed rail train
2 system shall follow existing transportation corridors or
3 utility corridors to the extent feasible. Because of that
4 requirement the alignments set out in the Central Valley
5 for a great length of the 120 miles, is close in proximity
6 to the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad. And because
7 of the different geometrics for the railroad compared to
8 the high-speed rail geometrics we have a lot of areas where
9 we go either under or over, or in close proximity to the
10 railroad.

11 And so we've been negotiating with them for quite
12 some time now to have them cooperate and coordinate with
13 us, because we're impacting their business. It's a
14 privately-held company that has stockholders and we are
15 causing a very inconvenience and a real effect to their
16 business. So the agreements are to try to lay out the
17 relationship between the parties and how they'll work
18 together to allow us to build our system in the Central
19 Valley.

20 Some of the things that BNSF will provide for us
21 in our project, which we were going to pay all their costs
22 for, is for reviewing and commenting on plans that show our
23 system in close proximity to their existing railroad. And
24 that is within a 250-foot area or proximity. Also they
25 will be attending meetings and coordinating ongoing site

1 investigations. We're buying property from them and then
2 we're relocating their railroad alignment in several
3 locations.

4 They have to give us permission to get on their
5 property to do assessments like environmental testing and
6 they have to give us safe passage to allow for construction
7 to take place. We have to coordinate with them on
8 schedules, so that when their train is in a close proximity
9 to our work or if they're in the areas where we're going
10 under and over, that we have a safe construction activity.
11 And we to make sure that the trains are coordinate, so that
12 construction workers aren't out there when trains are going
13 by. That is the freight trains.

14 So this is to seek approval to enter into a
15 couple of agreements that we have been working on with
16 BNSF. And then also to allow us to use funding that's
17 already being allocated to the project, both in the Central
18 Valley and to the Phase 1 to pay for all the costs
19 associated with our relationship with BNSF.

20 The first agreement that will establish how we're
21 going to work together is called a Relocation and
22 Construction Agreement. And in this agreement it lays out
23 how they're going to work with us to allow us to modify and
24 relocate certain facilities and improvements that they have
25 including tracks and signal systems and also, to again

1 approve plans and the like.

2 An important thing is that they have flaggers,
3 which are railroad designated personnel that are out there
4 on the construction site to communicate with the contractor
5 and the freight railroad operator to make sure that there's
6 no endangerment to the workers or to the train operators
7 while construction's ongoing. They're going to be doing a
8 lot of the work themselves, so when our design-builder
9 moves some of the railroad alignment that they have they
10 will build what are called shoo-flies and temporarily put
11 them out on existing or new alignment. And then we would
12 then use the property that they currently own and provide
13 them with a substitute property in some locations.

14 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: So Mr. Chairman?

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes?

16 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: You're presenting a lot of
17 stuff and so I want to ask you some questions as you go
18 along.

19 MR. FELLEENZ: Yes?

20 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: So I don't -- I'm old and I
21 don't want to lose my place, if you don't mind.

22 MR. FELLEENZ: Sure.

23 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: As you read through this
24 memo on what you're discussing what are the built-in
25 mechanisms for price control? We're on the hook to

1 reimburse them for their work.

2 MR. FELLEENZ: Yes.

3 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: How do we control what they
4 do from the perspective of cost analysis?

5 MR. FELLEENZ: Okay. First of all, we have their
6 rates for the people that work for them. Many of their
7 jobs that are held by people that will working on our
8 project are union members, so they have standard rates.
9 And we pay for them on an hourly basis, so we keep of the
10 hours. And what we'll do is we'll set up --

11 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Now how do we decide that
12 those are an appropriate number of hours? What are the
13 controls we have in that regard?

14 MR. FELLEENZ: So what we do is there's a project
15 coordinator on the BNSF side as well as the High-Speed Rail
16 side. So they will look at the construction schedule and
17 plan out the work that's going to impact the BNSF
18 facilities. And they'll do it in distinct pieces and
19 they're put together cost estimates for working on that
20 particular aspect of the project or piece of the project,
21 an estimated number of hours costs. And they will then
22 manage against that. Again, we have to reimburse them for
23 the actual costs, but there'll be a sense of how much.

24 In other words this will be \$100 million dollar
25 budget for the entire Central Valley that we have

1 estimated. And we will break it up into pieces. We
2 already have as you see in the chart, the table --

3 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Tom, I get all of that.
4 Still my question is much more simplistic. As we run
5 through the construct of these items, who has the final say
6 from the perspective of how many hours are being spent? I
7 mean, I could bill something more efficiently than someone
8 else. How do we maintain -- or less efficiently as the
9 case may be, but how do we have some concept of control?

10 So I have a contract with you that says I'm going
11 to pay you in unit cost of X.

12 MR. FELLEENZ: Right.

13 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: The question is, how do I
14 know that the number of unit's that you've expended are
15 appropriate? Or if they get to a place where I don't think
16 they're appropriate how do we deal with that issue?

17 MR. FELLEENZ: We would do it through coordinating
18 and cooperation. So there isn't a lump sum bid, so there
19 isn't a measure that this was divided into pieces. And
20 there isn't an agreement that it will be done for that
21 amount. In fact, it will be done for the actual cost
22 whether it's above or below that estimated amount for that
23 particular piece.

24 And the reason for this is that we are
25 inconveniencing and we need the cooperation of BNSF. It's

1 not to say that we don't have some controls through
2 communication with them about the efficiencies that occur
3 on the project from their staff. We can certainly
4 communicate that and we will be monitoring that in small
5 increments to make sure that the taxpayer is paying a fair
6 amount for what's being accomplished.

7 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Tom, I think the question
8 is, is it common, is it possible in agreements like this is
9 there a dispute resolution process?

10 MR. FELLEENZ: Yes, absolutely. We can dispute
11 invoices as well and we have auditors on our staff who
12 would be doing audit's of these provisions. And we're
13 using federal funds; these federal funds have audit
14 requirements as well. The federal grant monies have
15 federal flowdowns that have requirements for budgeting and
16 expenditure of funds. And that's what we have incorporated
17 into the agreements. We have the federal flowdowns in
18 these agreements as well, so we have the oversight of the
19 federal government as well as the state auditor, our
20 internal auditors that can look and make sure that we're
21 getting the value and it's appropriate, the charges being
22 made.

23 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: So in building
24 up the costs for instance we would look at -- take this
25 very specific example of we'll impacting their operations

1 for a six-hour window and so we'll need flag persons out
2 there onsite. And so the cost of that is built up from
3 that. As they submit their invoice if we see that they,
4 instead of having two flaggers had ten flaggers onsite for
5 instance, we could contest that and go back and audit and
6 not pay for those invoices.

7 MR. FELLEENZ: Correct. And we have estimators on
8 our side that have put these estimates together. So just
9 like an engineer's estimate that we compare bid prices to,
10 we get to take the engineer's estimate and compare what
11 components of work will be accomplished. And what we think
12 it should cost. We'll be discussing that with BNSF as we
13 build the system.

14 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Thank you.

15 MR. FELLEENZ: You're welcome.

16 So the Relocation and Construction Agreement
17 includes the cost for these federal flowdowns that I just
18 mentioned and a coordinator had mentioned as well.

19 Some the work that's going to be done by BNSF is
20 we will build the track bed and everything above the track
21 bed, including the tracks will done by their forces. And
22 the reason for this is because they have requested that.
23 They have unions with strong contracts with their company
24 and they want the union members to be doing that type of
25 work for a variety of reasons. They want to not disrupt

1 their business, because the unions would disagree with not
2 being able to perform that work. Their unions perform all
3 that track-laying work for their whole system and they have
4 certain quality work that they believe they would obtain by
5 having the tracks, which is one of the most important
6 elements in the structural piece of the infrastructure for
7 their system.

8 We also have what's called a Joint Corridor
9 Agreement that covers the entire Central Valley. And this
10 Corridor Agreement is looking out into the operation and
11 maintenance phase and our relationship to BNSF for
12 operations and maintenance.

13 I mentioned that they're concerned with our close
14 proximity within a 250-foot distance. And that in some
15 distance they want barriers placed, either ditches and
16 berms or concrete barriers to prevent if there was a
17 derailment by either the freight or a passenger rail from
18 one train getting into the operating envelope of the other
19 train. So we made commitments in these agreements to build
20 certain types of barriers, depending on the distance, away
21 from each other.

22 We also have made a commitment to provide
23 insurance to cover liability in case there was an accident
24 as well. This insurance will be paid for in the operations
25 phase and they're going to have the operator of our system

1 provide this insurance. That will cover both the High-
2 Speed Rail Authority and BNSF. We've looked at the
3 insurance, we have insurance experts on staff and also on
4 the private sector consulting with us. And we've looked at
5 the insurance availability for the amounts that BNSF is
6 requesting and assisting on. And we found that all that
7 insurance is available and that we have a yearly cost for
8 that insurance, which we think is a reasonable amount.

9 And in fact, the cost of this insurance is laid
10 out in our Draft 2016 Business Plan. If you look at the
11 Operations and Maintenance Cost Model documentation in our
12 Draft 2016 Business Plan, Section Number 13 it has a
13 section on insurance. And in that estimate we estimate for
14 Phase 1 all the insurance that would be required is %52
15 million a year. And that includes this insurance that
16 we're providing for the operations phase, which we believe
17 would cost \$4.8 to \$6.2 million per year based on
18 industry's feedback.

19 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: Mr. Chair, may I ask a
20 question?

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes, Ms. Paskett.

22 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: I'm similar to
23 Commissioner Rossi, I lose my train of thought if I wait
24 too long.

25 Why wouldn't we require -- why would we fund the

1 insurance for BNSF? Why wouldn't they fund it themselves,
2 is my first question. And then my second -- well, I'll let
3 you answer that and I have one more.

4 MR. FELLEENZ: Okay. So why would we pay for it
5 because we're coming to close to them, in close proximity
6 to them. And their cooperation is necessary and we need to
7 buy certain property from them. So laws in California
8 allow us to provide insurance --

9 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: Maybe let me ask you
10 differently. Are we insuring their work?

11 MR. FELLEENZ: No, we're insuring against third-
12 party causes of action if there was an accident.

13 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: Okay. That's my question.

14 MR. FELLEENZ: Yes.

15 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: Sorry, I wasn't more
16 clear. And then the second question is you had mentioned
17 just a minute earlier that they're going to use their labor
18 force. Is there any preference by the High-Speed Rail
19 Authority staff that they draw from the local community or
20 is it just that they're going to use their labor force and
21 that's where the conversation stops?

22 MR. FELLEENZ: We did not discuss with them
23 whether they would use local labor forces. You know,
24 there's union memberships with these railroads. And I
25 don't really know exactly how that works, but they're

1 essentially employees through the unions of the railroad.

2 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: If it's at all possible,
3 since we're funding this as you work with BNSF and their
4 unions if you could encourage them to look at that aspect
5 of it that would be good.

6 MR. FELLEENZ: Sure, I'd be happy to do that.

7 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: Thank you.

8 MR. FELLEENZ: We do have some other agreements
9 that we are entering into with BNSF that are focused on
10 land purchase of sale, and also the overpass agreements
11 where we have to have aerial easements over their property.
12 These will be handled in the property acquisition process
13 through the Public Works Board. So we don't need this
14 Board to approve these agreements, because the Public Works
15 Board as a separate board for property acquisition, would
16 do so.

17 I just wanted to mention that legal counsel
18 including myself have looked at these agreements, and we
19 hired outside counsel to work with us very closely and work
20 on these agreements as well. And these will all be
21 approved as to form before they're executed. And will
22 comply with all laws.

23 The budget implications for this is \$100 million,
24 and I just want to make it clear, this is not any kind of
25 change order. This is a forecasted, budgeted item in our

1 Phase 1 budget and is within our FCS budget.

2 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Well, let's be clear on
3 that. It's in the budget for what amount?

4 MR. FELLEENZ: \$100 million.

5 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: So then when we add a
6 contingency to it we'll be over budget?

7 MR. FELLEENZ: I'm sorry, that's without the
8 contingency. Okay, well it's \$130 million in the budget
9 right now.

10 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Okay.

11 MR. FELLEENZ: It's 130 million. This 100 million
12 does not include any contingency, because when we
13 consulted --

14 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I understand, we'll get to
15 that, but I just want --

16 MR. FELLEENZ: Yeah, okay.

17 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: -- when you say that it's
18 budgetary, we have a line item budget for an amount that is
19 equal to 30 million more than this number?

20 MR. FELLEENZ: Correct, correct.

21 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Thank you.

22 MR. FELLEENZ: You're welcome.

23 And then I just wanted to mention that we will be
24 providing a contingency analysis. Mr. Tapping will be
25 doing that and he will be presenting that at the Board

1 Meeting, which will include this BNSF item as well.

2 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: By the way, Mr. Chairman,
3 we've said now a number of times that when we get these
4 presentations we should have them sign off that this is
5 within the budget. So let's not say it again, let's just
6 have it happen going forward. When we make these types of
7 presentations could you be sure --

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: For the Board materials?

9 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: For the Board materials.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yeah.

11 MR. FELLEENZ: So I also just wanted to just
12 mention some of the benefit's that will be derived by High-
13 Speed Rail from -- or derived from our project to the
14 benefit of BNSF. We're going to eliminate 36 grade
15 crossing for BNSF in the Central Valley, another 14 for the
16 Union Pacific. And it's 20 percent of all the grade
17 separations or all the grade crossings, at grade crossing
18 where the mechanical arms come down to prevent the cars
19 from going into the -- or cross when the trains come by.
20 That's 20 percent of BNSF's at grade crossings.

21 We're going to reduce the maintenance costs for
22 both railroads, BNSF and Union Pacific, because of these
23 grade separations. So we're going to make it much safer.
24 There's going to be a reduced accident and fatality rates.
25 In fact, BNSF in negotiating has told me that the Central

1 Valley is one of the worst accident-rate areas within the
2 state for car versus train collisions, mainly because in
3 the Central Valley there's a lot of agricultural activity
4 and a lot of traffic with big trucks. And apparently
5 either through lack of operations of the train systems or
6 for whatever reason, there's a large number of accidents.

7 We're also going to straighten about five miles
8 of track by necessity, because of our project, of the BNSF
9 and that will help their operations.

10 I can answer any further questions and so we're
11 seeking Board approval to delegate to the CEO to sign these
12 railroad agreements in an amount not to exceed \$100
13 million. And we're going to present later a contingency
14 amount for this work.

15 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: Later this meeting
16 (indiscernible)

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Great, other questions?

18 BOARD MEMBER CURTIN: Yeah, Mr. Chairman?

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Curtin?

20 BOARD MEMBER CURTIN: So there's one little part
21 of this I don't get. Part of this work, not this work but
22 part of the work associated with the alignment along the
23 BNSF right-of-ways or some version of that is being done by
24 the design-build teams?

25 MR. FELLEENZ: Yes.

1 BOARD MEMBER CURTIN: So how come we have this
2 extra sort of beyond what we thought originally in the
3 design-build contracts? When did this surface and why
4 isn't it in the original design-build contracts?

5 MR. FELLEENZ: Because the BNSF Railroad wanted to
6 do that work themselves, some of that work themselves, on
7 their property. So we made it clear to the design-builders
8 not to include it in the bid.

9 BOARD MEMBER CURTIN: Okay. So this portion was
10 understood to be the situation --

11 MR. FELLEENZ: Right.

12 BOARD MEMBER CURTIN: -- but it was pulled out of
13 the original design-build contract?

14 MR. FELLEENZ: Right and most of this work will be
15 done on BNSF's property.

16 BOARD MEMBER CURTIN: Understood, that's what I'm
17 asking.

18 MR. FELLEENZ: Right.

19 BOARD MEMBER CURTIN: So it wasn't like oh, we
20 discovered this all of a sudden.

21 MR. FELLEENZ: No, no.

22 BOARD MEMBER CURTIN: And secondly, I mean it's
23 perfectly understandable that BNSF would want to do this
24 work on their property. And I guess these are the portions
25 that they identified as, I guess, mission critical for

1 them. So all of this discussion I kind of have a little
2 concern being raised of well the unions this, the unions
3 that. This is BNSF's decision, this is their corporate
4 approach. They build railroads, they don't want anybody
5 messing around with their business.

6 MR. FELLEENZ: Right.

7 BOARD MEMBER CURTIN: And I think we can leave it
8 at that, because there are implications here that, "Oh gee,
9 if the unions would've agreed we could have done it
10 differently."

11 MR. FELLEENZ: Right.

12 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Another, I
13 think it's really more about the operational nature of
14 their business.

15 BOARD MEMBER CURTIN: Exactly.

16 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: And maintenance
17 issues going forward and things, they want control over
18 that and so that was the decision that they made.

19 BOARD MEMBER CURTIN: It wasn't clear in the
20 document that this wasn't a new development.

21 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: And just I want
22 to make sure it's clear in case anyone's confused, when we
23 talk about them doing the track work it's for BNSF track,
24 not any of our track. It's just for theirs.

25 BOARD MEMBER CURTIN: Just as we wouldn't want

1 them doing our track work to their standards, they don't
2 want us messing with their tracks there.

3 MR. FELLEENZ: And another component that's in the
4 memo, that type of work that they're going to do on their
5 own system is the signal system. And again, you can see
6 why they may want to do that. This is to control their
7 freight trains and so they don't want us building that
8 system and they insisted that they do it themselves.

9 BOARD MEMBER CURTIN: Sure.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Are there questions at
11 this point?

12 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I have one for Mr. Tapping
13 as part of this presentation.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay.

15 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: How much time have you had
16 to look at this as we sit?

17 MR. TAPPING: It's been an ongoing from the risk
18 management perspective.

19 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yeah, because I want to ask
20 you a question about order of magnitude, but if you don't
21 have enough data I have no problem with you saying no.
22 It's perfectly fine, but from what I would -- the question
23 I'd like to ask you, and if you don't have yet enough data
24 it's perfectly fine -- is that as you look at where we are,
25 does it look like the contingency number will be within the

1 \$30 million envelope?

2 And if you don't know enough yet Jon, that's
3 fine. That may be way ahead of you and I don't want you --

4 MR. TAPPING: I would say I don't know. I don't
5 know at this point, but I would that it's not inconsistent
6 with other agreements --

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Hold on one second, Jon.

8 (Colloquy regarding mic.)

9 MR. TAPPING: We're doing that analysis now and
10 plan to report at a Finance and Audit Committee in May, so
11 I don't know. But I don't think it's inconsistent with
12 magnitudes for this type of work with railroad utilities.

13 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Thank you.

14 MR. TAPPING: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: With no further questions --

16 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a
17 motion for approval.

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right.

19 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: Second.

20 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right. It's been moved by
22 Vice Chair Richards and seconded by both Ms. Paskett and
23 Mr. Rossi. Would the Secretary please call the roll?

24 MS. HARLAN: Vice Chair Richards?

25 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.

1 MS. HARLAN: Director Rossi?

2 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yes.

3 MS. HARLAN: Director Correa?

4 BOARD MEMBER CORREA: Yes.

5 MS. HARLAN: Director Curtin?

6 BOARD MEMBER CURTIN: Yes.

7 MS. HARLAN: Director Paskett?

8 BOARD MEMBER PASKETT: Yes.

9 MS. HARLAN: Director Lowenthal?

10 BOARD MEMBER LOWENTHAL: Yes.

11 MS. HARLAN: Chair Richard?

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

13 Thank you. Okay. The next item is a brief
14 update on the Business Plan comments.

15 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: I was going to
16 say this could be very brief. We've heard public comment
17 on the Business Plan. I'm just providing a quick update on
18 where we are. We've talked -- obviously the Business Plan
19 is due every two years to the Legislature. We are in the
20 public comment period. We have a variety of means of
21 accepting public comment including at this Board Meeting
22 where we did hear comment today. People are able to submit
23 comments in writing through the Web, other means.

24 I do want to point out we've had over the last
25 two weeks, three different legislative hearings involving

1 five different committees on the Business Plan. And so
2 that, again, goes into the record. We've also had
3 extensive discussions with our regional partners and some
4 of that's been reflected in the public comment today.

5 As of April 4th we've received 77 formal comments
6 into the system. I'm not going to talk today about the
7 substance of those comments, because we're still in the
8 middle of the process. When we come back to the Board next
9 week, in San Jose, to present we will discuss in detail the
10 nature of the comments, what categories they fell into,
11 what types of issues were raised. And how the staff is
12 proposing to those comments for the Board's consideration
13 and deliberation.

14 Just a quick snapshot of those 77 comments and
15 just to give a sense that we do go through and sort them,
16 try to categorize by the nature of the comments. Are they
17 looking at particular areas or more general comments? This
18 summary again, will be presented to the full Board next
19 week.

20 And finally, in the nature of brevity we will be
21 continuing to receive and review comments over the next
22 week through the end of the comment period on the 18th.
23 We'll be back before the Board on the 21st, and we'll be
24 seeking direction from the Board in order to finalize the
25 plan at that point.

1 And with that I think we're done.

2 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: You've lost your quorum up
3 there, Jeff.

4 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Take that as a
5 resounding confirmation of the direction.

6 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: For the two of yes, for the
7 two of us left are there any questions? Director
8 Lowenthal?

9 BOARD MEMBER LOWENTHAL: Where is everyone?

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: We're just doing logistical
11 stuff.

12 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Okay. Thank you.

13 BOARD MEMBER LOWENTHAL: No, I do look forward to
14 our next meeting and hearing a wrap-up more extensively.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Let me apologize, Mr. Morales.
16 I really thought it was more for the public, so I was just
17 taking a moment to do some logistical things.

18 I have, in fact, read through all the Business
19 Plan comments we've received so far and intend to continue
20 to do that. So I don't want my stepping away from the
21 podium to be misinterpreted as anything other than allowing
22 you to give a chance or update for the public. But anyway,
23 thank you.

24 Okay. Did you have anything else to add on that,
25 Jeff?

1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: No.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: At this point it's 11:30 and
3 the next items are all ones that have a great number of
4 public comments in addition to the fact that we have
5 presentations. So rather than try to drive through all
6 that and have everybody's blood sugar go to zero, I'm going
7 to suggest that we take a 30-minute break.

8 There is a food court that I understand is near
9 the Hilton and should afford people to get some sustenance.
10 We'll take a very strict 30-minute break and reconvene at
11 noon. And then we'll use that time to get public comment
12 for Public Comment Session Number 2.

13 So we'll be in recess.

14 (Off the record at 11:32 a.m.)

15 (On the record at 12:07 p.m.)

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Ladies and gentlemen, if I
17 could ask you to take your seats, please.

18 (Colloquy as attendees return.)

19 All right, we will be back in session. And this
20 is the commencement of Public Comment Session II, which are
21 public comments on the Supplemental Alternatives Analyses
22 Alignment. Let me just say three things at the outset.

23 Number one, we do have a number of public
24 speakers, so as we did in the prior session I will ask
25 people to confine their remarks to three minutes, so that

1 all of your friends and neighbors can be heard.

2 Second, I'm conscious of the fact that the crowd
3 is smaller than it was before we took the lunch break. So
4 I suspect that not everybody has come back yet. People
5 will be filtering in. So what we will do is as we go
6 through if somebody's not here, I'll put their card in the
7 file. I will go back through and call it again to give
8 people an opportunity, so that if they were stuck in a
9 lunch line they don't lose their chance to speak. But
10 after a couple of times calling them, then we will move on.

11 We'll take the cards in order that we received.
12 We generally do recognize elected officials as the
13 representatives of their communities first. However in
14 some cases, certain elected officials have asked to be
15 grouped together with their constituents and we will
16 respect that. So you'll see that play out as we go
17 forward.

18 So with that, we'll now move into this session.
19 And we'll start with I think its Nelson Pichardo
20 representing Assemblymember Lopez; is that right?

21 Michael Cano representing Los Angeles County
22 Supervisor Mike Antonovich; Mr. Cano, welcome.

23 MR. CANO: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Board Members
24 and Mr. Morales. I first want to thank our new Board
25 Members, Member Paskett and Member Lowenthal. Welcome and

1 thank you for bringing your expertise and your knowledge of
2 Southern California and transportation issues to this
3 Board. It will be very helpful for us as we work through
4 the remaining issues on the Palmdale to Burbank Alignment
5 specifically.

6 I was asked to speak on behalf of Supervisor
7 Antonovich regarding the Palmdale to Burbank Project and
8 the current state. And this has been a long and arduous
9 task to find a route that's suitable for the communities
10 and for the project between Palmdale and Burbank, which
11 both locations have great potential for transportation
12 links and ridership potential in Southern California.

13 It's been a difficult one for many of our
14 communities. We represent Palmdale, Acton, Agua Dulce,
15 Santa Clarita. We represent Kagel Canyon, Lake View
16 Terrace, Shadow Hills and Burbank.

17 And first I want to start by saying we greatly
18 appreciate the leadership of Chair Richard and the entire
19 Authority for taking seriously the requests the Supervisor
20 made over a year from today to look at other ways of
21 connecting Palmdale to Burbank looking at a more direct,
22 more tunnel-orientated and less community intrusive route.
23 That has now led to some new routes that have gone
24 underneath the mountains and away from the prior routes,
25 especially along the State Route 14.

1 This breakthrough from the prior alignments, with
2 refined alternatives now allows us to avoid entirely the
3 communities of Santa Clarita, San Fernando, Sylmar and most
4 of Pacoima and Kagel Canyons. So we're very much
5 appreciate of that, but he does want to make sure that he
6 expresses to you that there's still a lot of work to be
7 done and we're not there yet. And the remaining
8 alternatives do have impacts that we want to work with you
9 on, especially with the Town of Acton and the communities
10 of Lake View Terrace and Shadow Hills.

11 Especially with E2, the aboveground elements
12 coming out of the mountain and dividing the community of
13 Lake View Terrace before it crosses the bridge into the --
14 below Shadow Hills -- is of great concern to the
15 Supervisor. Not just in terms of the property issues, but
16 also the division of the community and potentially creating
17 issues there that we're trying to avoid in other parts of
18 the route, taking a community and dividing it in half with
19 a potential viaduct or at-grade segment.

20 And there are also other features in terms of the
21 ecological resources and the equestrian resources there
22 that we need to take a look at. He would prefer to have
23 you to remove entirely at this point if that is possible.
24 We're not quite sure what latitude you have as an
25 Authority, but if that route is possible to be removed,

1 that would be something that he would support
2 wholeheartedly.

3 One of the biggest problems we do have is by the
4 nature of this process is that it is going to be many, many
5 months until we have closure on which routes have been
6 removed and which is the locally-preferred alternative.
7 And for the residents in Lake View Terrace especially, to
8 have their properties basically being deemed potential
9 takes, is a concern.

10 We also have concern with Acton, on the SR14, and
11 we urge you to continue working with them not just on the
12 aboveground elements and the routes and the issues there.
13 But also making sure that we take a look at the water
14 issues and make sure we don't disrupt their dependence on
15 wells and their quality of life up there.

16 So thank you very much. We appreciate working
17 with you. And please provide us a clear roadmap on when
18 our communities can expect to have information on different
19 stages of the remainder of the environmental process.

20 So thank you very much.

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Cano, and
22 respects to the Supervisor, so thank you.

23 Councilmember Marsha McLean followed by
24 Councilmember Sylvia Ballin from San Fernando.

25 COUNCILMEMBER MCLEAN: Hi, good afternoon. And

1 I'm really happy that you broke for lunch, so that we're
2 all kind of rejuvenated again. My name is Marsha McLean
3 and I'm the Council Member for the City of Santa Clarita.
4 I am the immediate past mayor.

5 I am very involved in many, many boards and
6 commissions and COGs regarding transportation issues. And
7 of course, this has been on a high priority for us. And I
8 understand economic development. And I totally understand
9 how Anaheim and Palmdale and Burbank and some of the other
10 centers where you're going to be placing your stations, are
11 very much in favor of it. Your hard job and staff's hard
12 job is to try and figure out how do you get the train from
13 place to place without disrupting communities?

14 I'm very grateful that you understood and
15 understand the devastation that would have occurred had you
16 gone through our churches and our schools and our homes in
17 Santa Clarita. And that you have moved it to the
18 outskirts. The Route 14 still is a little bit troubling,
19 because a portion of it does hit Santa Clarita. And then
20 it is disruptive to the Community of Acton.

21 We have been working with the coalition and it
22 includes the City of San Fernando, the community of
23 Sunland-Tujunga, Shadow Hills, Acton, Agua Dulce, Lake View
24 Terrace and Pacoima. And we do totally appreciate your
25 taking into consideration the impacts and trying to figure

1 out a route. We would hope that you would continue to have
2 staff figure out a route that will not disrupt any of us --
3 not only Santa Clarita, but the rest as well.

4 And the City of Santa Clarita City Council
5 adopted the position that we are for totally underground
6 tunnel from Burbank to Palmdale. And it makes the most
7 sense. You can avoid all of the problems with all of these
8 communities by doing that. And you just need to go
9 underground from the airport. And I'm sure you can do that
10 engineering-wise that way.

11 So anyway, we're going to continue work together
12 with the other with the other communities. And ask you
13 please to make sure that you look at a route that's not
14 going to impact any of the communities that we're concerned
15 about. And once again, we understand economic development.
16 And we understand how the communities all want to have the
17 station where they can reap the benefits of that.

18 And then one other thing, gentleman from SCAG--
19 just real quickly -- gentleman from SCAG mentioned the MOU.
20 We are hoping that you will continue to work with our
21 region to have the monies go to help with our Metrolink
22 track and rail for connectivity sooner rather than later.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Councilmember.

24 COUNCILMEMBER MCLEAN: Thank you very, very much.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: We'll next have Council Member

1 and former mayor Sylvia Ballin followed by I understand
2 Nelson Pichardo from Assemblywoman Lopez's staff is back.

3 COUNCILMEMBER BALLIN: Thank you very much for
4 inviting us all the way to Anaheim today. It would be very
5 nice if you do something up by our area. We would
6 appreciate it.

7 I want to start by saying I'll vote no. And as a
8 form of protest I'm asking everyone that opposes the high-
9 speed rail to make our voices heard and vote no on every
10 ballot measure in the November 2016 Ballot.

11 Clearly, we are not being heard by our Governor
12 and our electives, so my position is asking everyone from
13 Southern California to Northern California if you do not
14 support the high-speed rail and the billions of dollars
15 it's going to cost and the impact to all these communities
16 from the south to the north, we should let everyone know
17 exactly how we feel. Let our electeds know how we feel and
18 vote 100 percent no on every ballot measure that's put in
19 front of us.

20 How do we trust that what we vote for is going to
21 be what is presented to us in the future? And high-speed
22 rail is a very, very good example of the Governor moving
23 forward with something that's going to cost billions and
24 billions of dollars, impact our children and grand
25 children. And I don't feel that the priority of water --

1 he is not giving water the priority it deserves. So I'm
2 just going to stand before all those that are opposed to
3 high-speed rail and ask please vote no on every ballot
4 measure in November 2016.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Ballin.

6 Nelson Pichardo from Assemblywoman Lopez's
7 Office, followed by Joel Fajardo, Mayor of San Fernando.

8 MR. PICHARDO: Great. I want to thank you,
9 Chairman Richard, Board. I come on behalf of Assemblywoman
10 Patty Lopez. She represents the 39th District. She could
11 not be here, but she sent a letter. Here's a copy for each
12 of you and I would like to read it on her behalf, okay?

13 "Dear Chairman Dan Richard, it is with a sense of
14 reaffirmation and duty to represent the needs of my
15 constituents that I unequivocally continue to oppose this
16 project. The High-Speed Rail Project has been, and
17 continues to be, one of the most heated and contested
18 projects our District 39 has ever witnessed. It has
19 created, organized and galvanized many groups, communities
20 and entities against it.

21 "It has produced such backlash, as I understand,
22 for many reasons which continue to remain unresolved. The
23 communities will have to acquiesce to the demands of what
24 would be the biggest single transportation project
25 currently in the United States of America. Have not asked

1 for it, will not utilize it, and will not see anything
2 except rails and eyesores reminding them of what was
3 imposed on them.

4 "The project does not provide sufficient
5 contractual returns for businesses to be seriously
6 considered as an incentive or a welcome catalyst for an
7 economic boost to District 39. I am currently not aware
8 of any serious plan, amount of funding, or number of
9 contracts that will target the most impoverished areas and
10 businesses of District 39. And still, we continue to hear
11 about how these communities will gain and improve, because
12 of the project.

13 "Even as proposed routes between Palmdale to
14 Burbank continue to be modified due to a high level of
15 pressure from constituents, the communities from District
16 39 continue to be affected. And people fear that their way
17 of life will be forever affected against their will.

18 "I have to stand firm with my constituents and
19 demand that their fears are heard. The project needs to
20 address the demands from these constituent groups and begin
21 to exercise a different and more robust approach to
22 stakeholder engagement. It is necessary that those most
23 affected, those who traditionally have no voice, and those
24 who are clamoring for a commitment to transparency and
25 communication finally have an opportunity to experience

1 such obligation.

2 "Even though I can authoritatively express the
3 feelings from the communities in my District, as I have
4 through this letter, I feel the need to speak on behalf of
5 many Californians who are also in strong opposition to this
6 project at a time when our state is facing many crisis and
7 could use these funds to meet these challenges head on.

8 "I'm willing to put any effort necessary to work
9 in partnership with the appropriate staff or engaging our
10 communities, so that they feel satisfied and receive
11 necessary resolution. Thank you for taking my input.

12 "Sincerely, Patty Lopez, Assemblywoman, District
13 39."

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir. (Applause.)

15 Mayor Fajardo followed by Robert Gonzales.

16 VICE-MAYOR FAJARDO: Thank you for the
17 introduction although I should clarify that we did have our
18 annual rotation and I am now the vice-mayor.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I'm sorry sir. I guess the
20 last time I saw you, I think you were Mayor.

21 VICE-MAYOR FAJARDO: No problem.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay.

23 VICE-MAYOR FAJARDO: I appreciate that.

24 And I thank you for everyone for the opportunity
25 to speak. And many thanks to the community members who

1 came out today. These really are the heroes of our
2 community, the people, the activists willing to come out,
3 speak truth to power, stand for their community and stand
4 with one another.

5 I think that my position on the High-Speed Rail
6 Project is very clear to the Board, but I continue to
7 oppose this project. I know this is a vanity project at a
8 time when we are in a crisis in California, when we have
9 many needs here at home and throughout the State: improving
10 our local infrastructure, improving our streets and roads,
11 investing in water conservation and production and ending
12 homelessness.

13 While I certainly would like to see more jobs, I
14 believe that we can do that as we continue to invest in our
15 community. And it is irresponsible for us to continue with
16 a project that hinges on a "surprise source of funding in
17 order to fund this mandate." We simply do not have the
18 funding for this project and I hope that the Board will
19 take this position and take it back to Governor Brown.

20 I do appreciate and approve of some of the
21 changes that were made to SR14, most specifically the
22 removal of the City of San Fernando. However at the same
23 time, I recognize that there are still many communities
24 that are affected. The City of San Fernando was spared
25 from being divided in half and forced into bankruptcy. Yet

1 there are still many constituencies throughout the 39th
2 District and the Northeast San Fernando Valley that will
3 have many adverse impact to their communities.

4 That is why I am here today to continue standing
5 with my colleagues, my friends, and my neighbors to ensure
6 that we continue to work on this project to improve all the
7 routes. There are many people who are left behind. And I
8 believe it is incumbent upon the Board to remove first and
9 foremost any routes that have at-grade or elevated
10 portions. In addition to that, we need to continue to look
11 for alternative routes and consider a no Burbank
12 alternative. Even though a no-Burbank alternative may not
13 be the final solution to some of these problems I believe
14 that it has merit and is certainly worth studying.

15 In addition, I urge the Board to consider
16 scrapping the Mineta Study for a more inclusive study, one
17 that has experts in this field. The Mineta Study is an
18 equestrian study that was done at an institution that does
19 not specialize in the equestrian culture. There are many
20 places, both local and far, that could do a much better
21 study than they did.

22 And so I ask you today, that as you report on
23 this project to please consider our communities, to have
24 better routes, to remove those with the most destructions,
25 and to give the other remaining cities the response and

1 respect that they deserve. Thank you for your time.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. (Applause.)

3 And now Mayor Robert Gonzales from the City of
4 San Fernando, Mayor?

5 MAYOR GONZALES: Thank you. So today, I'm
6 standing here in front of you as the new Mayor of the City
7 of San Fernando. And I really want to let everybody know
8 and remind everybody how important that is that the high-
9 speed rail does not go through the City of San Fernando. I
10 know I've had the opportunity to have you out there,
11 Chairman, and show you around town to show you the impacts
12 of what the City of San Fernando would face on our historic
13 City of San Fernando.

14 My son is currently the sixth generation to live
15 in the city. I understand that there can be benefits to
16 the high-speed rail in other communities, but through our
17 community would absolutely devastate us. It would remove
18 over 800 jobs. It would remove over \$1.3 million to our
19 general fund and would surely put us into bankruptcy. So I
20 just want to remind you guys that the City of San Fernando
21 will continue to be here to continue to make sure that the
22 high-speed rail does not go through the City of San
23 Fernando.

24 And also, hopefully, you guys will also take into
25 consideration our neighboring cities and the impacts it

1 will have on them, especially with the high walls, the
2 vibration, and the dust particles and any other
3 construction. And I also would like to say that it was
4 very difficult to get a lot of our community members out
5 here, because we're a working class community. And we
6 actually had to charter a bus and bring community members
7 out here. We left at 6:00 o'clock in the morning to come
8 out here to be here today. So it's extremely important to
9 our community that we not also show support for one
10 another, but we show you guys that we have the support that
11 it should not and cannot go through the City of San
12 Fernando.

13 So here I have a petition that some of our
14 community members that were on the bus with us today have
15 signed. And I would just like to give this over to you
16 guys, so you guys can keep that for your records.

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: The Secretary will be happy to
18 take that, Mayor.

19 MR. GONZALEZ: Thank you so much.

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir. (Applause.)

21 I think the next several speakers are all city --
22 so maybe then can just kind of line up in turn: Brian Saeki
23 who is the City Manager, Fred Ramirez from the City, and
24 Anthony Vairo. So if we could just have people come up so
25 that we can give everybody a chance to speak.

1 MR. SAEKI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good
2 afternoon, I had good morning here, it's actually good
3 afternoon now. Board Members and staff, my name is Brian
4 Saeki. I'm the City Manager for the City of San Fernando.
5 Thank you for the opportunity today to speak to you as the
6 high-speed rail continues to move forward.

7 I was somewhat relieved at the newest project
8 alternatives. And I say somewhat relieved, because being
9 involved in the development process I'm very well aware
10 that while the newest alternatives avoid impacting the city
11 today, they're not set in stone and another alternative
12 that could affect San Fernando could be incorporated during
13 the environmental process.

14 It's for this reason that we are all here today
15 to restate that there are several critical environmental
16 impacts associated with the high-speed rail coming through
17 San Fernando. There are of course the standard impacts:
18 aesthetics, safety and security, circulation, vehicular and
19 pedestrian traffic, noise vibration, dust, utilities,
20 infrastructure. We've sent our concerns regarding these
21 and other impacts to the Board as you know on numerous
22 occasions.

23 In addition, a few months ago, and this is
24 probably the most critical issue that we're faced with, and
25 that is we sent the HSR Board an Economic Impact Analysis.

1 You'll be hearing from our Finance Director a little bit
2 later. And that showed about a \$1.3 or so million loss or
3 so to our General Fund. That's 10 percent of our annual
4 operating money every year, so it will pay for police,
5 public works, help keep the doors and the lights open for
6 the businesses and the residences in San Fernando. And
7 there was also a potential loss of close to 1,000 jobs in
8 our town -- 2.4 square miles, 25 or 24,000 people --
9 catastrophic.

10 Lastly, I wanted to stress our concerns again in
11 regards to environmental justice. As we all know one of
12 the many issues that environmental justice seeks is to
13 address that of environmental discrimination. Why is it
14 that there are a disproportionate amount of waste
15 management and highly-politicized projects in minority-
16 dominated communities? In San Fernando, we already have a
17 Metrolink and Union Pacific rail lines that are highly
18 disruptive to our community. We feel that that's enough.

19 Thank you again for your time.

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Saeki. And I
21 believe I mispronounced your name. I apologize for that.

22 Fred Ramirez from the City.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, Fred had told me
24 that he had to leave.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Then we'll move on to

1 Nick Kimball from San Fernando followed by David Cameron.

2 MR. KIMBALL: Good afternoon, Board. My name is
3 Nick Kimball, I'm the Finance Director for the City of San
4 Fernando.

5 Although the SR14 Route has been amended to avoid
6 the City of San Fernando, as Brian and our elected have
7 just alluded to its regional economic impact on San
8 Fernando, Sylmar, Pacoima and the surrounding communities
9 will still be significant. There are clear winners and
10 losers in the High-Speed Rail's plans. The affluent,
11 urban, tourist-based economies of Burbank and Anaheim
12 clearly support the plan, because they get the benefit of a
13 rail station and billions of dollars in private and public
14 investment.

15 Unfortunately, this is a zero-sum game. So the
16 communities that benefit do so at the expense of the
17 working class, residential communities in the Northeast
18 valley that are rich in culture and history, but are not
19 tourist economies and do not have a station in commuting
20 proximity. Any route through the Northeast Valley will
21 require significant eminent domain activity and
22 displacement of local residents.

23 From what I can see, there would be little to no
24 offsetting long-term economic benefit as the price for
25 riding the train will be cost prohibitive for potential

1 employees in the Northeast Valley labor market. Other than
2 a short-term increase in jobs during construction, the on-
3 going long-term economic loss will be significant. Thank
4 you.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir. (Applause.)

6 David Cameron followed by Kathleen Trinity from
7 Acton.

8 MR. CAMERON: Hello. My name is David Cameron,
9 I'm with the Teamsters Rail Conference. We represent 1.4
10 million workers in the United States, 202,000 here in
11 California, 2,770 in the zip codes along E2. And we are in
12 full support of the project.

13 I've listened here at this meeting and I've
14 listened at other meetings of those who have expressed a
15 deep appreciation for the Hansen Dam Recreation Area and
16 their deep fear that the construction of high-speed rail.
17 That it will fatally this precious eco system. I've ridden
18 horses there. I've walked along its quiet creeks. And it
19 is indeed an astonishing jewel of raw, untrammelled beauty.
20 And it is an important natural asset to Los Angeles. I
21 think there's much wisdom in the importance of protecting
22 and preserving it.

23 However, I feel the solution of simply stopping
24 high-speed rail or prematurely removing alternate routes
25 before they are thoroughly explored is misguided. I was

1 recently at a conference on climate change in New York
2 City. This planet is in great peril. If we do not take
3 dramatic action to dramatically reduce CO2 emissions over
4 the next several decades, Hansen Dam will not be a
5 beautiful, lush recreation area of rolling streams. It
6 will be Hansen Desert. Its creeks will dry, its vegetation
7 will shrivel, its beautiful ecosystem will be a barren
8 stretch of sand and rock.

9 High-speed rail will remove literally millions of
10 cars and trucks from our roads and thousands of short-haul
11 flights from our skies dramatically reducing the amount of
12 carbon we pour into the atmosphere.

13 Now, it is true, should this Authority consider a
14 route that includes a viaduct over the Eastern edge of this
15 beautiful area, it will have a short-term deleterious
16 effect. But nature is very restorative. After all, this
17 area was once home to a gravel yard that temporarily
18 destroyed its ecosystem, but it has rebounded. The same
19 may be said of the dam that was built there in the 40's.
20 So I would plead with those who oppose this project. Let's
21 be patient. This is a long process. Let's not take
22 alternatives off the table prematurely.

23 The opponents are worried that a proposed viaduct
24 will be ugly and spoil the natural beauty of the Wash. The
25 same was said of the Golden Gate Bridge, that it would

1 destroy the natural beauty of the San Francisco Bay, but it
2 is now an iconic image of San Francisco and has added great
3 beauty to that city. The proposed viaduct can be the same.
4 It can be an architectural wonder, adding great beauty to
5 the Hansen Wash and become an iconic image of Los Angeles.

6 In the final analysis, if we are to have Hansen
7 Dam and not a bone-like Hansen Desert we must dramatically
8 lower our carbon footprint in the coming decades. High-
9 speed rail is a proven means of achieving that.

10 Let's not fight this project. Let's get behind
11 it do save this beautiful area. Let's put our shoulders to
12 the wheel to get it built and built quickly. Let's rise
13 above short-sighted, short-term parochial interests. Let's
14 lift our vision to the horizon and seek to protect this
15 cherished area, not just for our own enjoyment, but for
16 generations to come. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Cameron. Thank
18 you.

19 Kathleen Trinity followed by Frank Oliveira.

20 MS. TRINITY: Yes, Chairman Richard. I'm
21 Kathleen Trinity, but I do see that there are two members
22 from the Acton Town Council who I think would have
23 precedents.

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: That's fine.

25 MS. TRINITY: Okay. Well, I guess they're

1 deferring to me, so I'll go ahead.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. If Mr. Oliveira doesn't
3 mind, what I'll do is ask them to speak immediately after
4 Ms. Trinity. Thank you. And I apologize for that. So go
5 ahead, ma'am.

6 MS. TRINITY: Good afternoon, Chairman Richard
7 and Board Members.

8 Now that you have narrowed down the possible
9 routes through Acton I think it's time to sit back and look
10 at the price. I'm not referring to the \$64 to \$68 billion
11 price tag, but to the price that will be paid by Acton as
12 well as by other affected communities.

13 I personally can forgive the debt of lost sleep,
14 anxiety and lost time, while dealing with the prospect of
15 high-speed rail through my community. What I cannot
16 forgive however, is the unnecessary blight and degradation
17 of my community, not to mention a future of day-long
18 disruptive noise for the rest of our lives and the losses
19 to equestrians, wild life and habitat, where the train will
20 daylight. The affected communities will pay the price.

21 According to your most recent map showing huge
22 viaducts over Red Rover Mine Canyon that would be on the
23 SR14, and on the E1 and E2 Routes Forest into Kentucky
24 Springs up to the homes near El Sastre and in Aliso Canyon
25 it appears that there is still not enough concern for my

1 community. I am grateful for the effort to add more
2 tunneling.

3 I do not know the precise location of the other
4 three viaducts, but I do know Red Rover Mine Canyon. There
5 are 112 homes, about 30 percent with horses. By placing
6 the one-mile viaduct and tunnel -- the tunnel is the key
7 here -- at or near the parabolic focus of the canyon you
8 simply destroy it. Moving it up would take out more homes.

9 What I would like to know is why your plan
10 persists in this massive crossing with a huge noise-
11 generating four-track tunnel on our east hill? Our elderly
12 would be more prone to cardiovascular events. Our infants
13 will not sleep and our equestrians will be driven out.
14 Please remove these horrible viaducts and at-grade routes,
15 especially with their booming tunnels, from Acton
16 especially and Red Rover included.

17 What could justify transforming a peaceful
18 community into an industrial area? I really don't think
19 Californians want to see their natural spaces and small
20 communities blighted. These are places actually that we
21 should be preserving. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Trinity.

23 I only have one other speaker card from Acton and
24 that's Ms. Ayer.

25 MS. AYER: I don't think that Pam's speaking

1 today.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay, that's fine.

3 Jacqueline Ayer and then Frank Oliviera.

4 MS. AYER: Thank you very much for this
5 opportunity. I have had a chance to review the SSA, the
6 maps and the agenda. And I know that staff has tried very
7 hard to make them all consistent, but they are not. In
8 fact, the map on the back of your agenda item differs
9 substantially from the map in your SSA, particularly as it
10 traverses Acton.

11 Your SSA describes Refined E1 and E2 as traveling
12 under the Metrolink line, under Vincent View Road, under
13 Foreston. This is completely untrue. In fact, your map
14 shows that it clearly is entirely aboveground for two
15 miles, in this section of Acton.

16 Your SSA describes Refined E1 and E2 in Acton,
17 south of Aliso as, "traveling southwest in a tunnel beneath
18 the ANF." Again completely untrue -- your map clearly
19 shows that between Aliso and Burbank you punch through
20 Acton aboveground in two more places. In fact, the one
21 segment from the 2015 route alignments that was actually
22 below ground is now aboveground in the 2016 alignment.
23 You've actually made it worse for Acton in the southern
24 areas.

25 You still have a section that's greater than a

1 mile long on the S14 Route that is just a couple thousand
2 feet from our brand-new high school and it runs through an
3 established residential neighborhood as you heard from
4 Kathleen.

5 The new proposed routes show that you have been
6 listening and I am grateful for that. You heard San
7 Fernando, and the new routes avoid San Fernando. You heard
8 Santa Clarita, and now the routes avoid the core of Santa
9 Clarita and much of Santa Clarita although there's still a
10 part apparently that's problematic. You heard Kagel Canyon
11 and now the route goes under Kagel Canyon. You heard Lake
12 View Terrace and provided a forest route that is entirely
13 underground in Lake View Terrace. The fact is --

14 (Off mic colloquy from audience.)

15 MS. AYER: Well, according to the maps they are.
16 Maybe they are --

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Let her speak, please.

18 MS. AYER: The fact is every single community
19 south of Palmdale is fully protected by at least one route,
20 except Acton. Every route, no matter what you do, has
21 significant aboveground portions in Acton. In fact, I
22 believe its E1, it's entirely aboveground in Acton except
23 for two places where it goes under a mountain.

24 I need you, the Town Council needs you, and the
25 Community of Acton needs you to hear Acton the way you've

1 heard all the other communities and accommodated them
2 largely, not entirely apparently, but Acton has gotten
3 nothing. So please hear us.

4 I want to make sure that the routes that we see
5 going forward address these concerns. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Ayer.

7 Frank Oliveira.

8 MR. OLIVEIRA: Frank Oliveira, Citizens for
9 California High-speed Rail Accountability. I've been
10 sitting here wondering what I was going to say. I came
11 down here to Southern California to see what the Board was
12 going to do and what you were going to explain about the
13 Business Plan and the routes south in this part of the
14 State.

15 The one thing that comes to my mind is bad
16 planning. And we've discussed this for six years now. If
17 you start with bad planning you have bad foundation. You
18 have a bad project in the end, because it's too hard to
19 correct, or it's harder to correct and do things right.
20 We've asked you to do things right.

21 But what I see is communities that are being
22 burned. San Diego's burned, because there's no reference
23 to Phase 2 in the Business Plan. The local transportation
24 agencies in Southern California that want grade crossings,
25 well ultimately they'll be burned, because of the second

1 funding plan dilemma. The communities that are subject to
2 EIRs, you're dealing with a 15 percent EIR design-build
3 process, leaving 85 percent of the details to be handled by
4 the design-builder yet to be determined at a future date,
5 that will modify the project no matter what was said in the
6 EIR, to something different. So their communities will be
7 burned.

8 Acton obviously gets burned based on multiple
9 routes going through their community.

10 Palmdale gets burned, because there's not enough
11 money to build into the southern end of Phase 1.

12 Bakersfield gets burned. Those components that
13 would like the project to exist in Bakersfield, they get
14 burned because there's no money to get into Bakersfield.

15 Those who oppose the project get burned because
16 the specter of things hanging over their head. Shafter
17 gets burned, because well all of sudden they're a
18 destination point. Shafter doesn't get the heavy
19 maintenance facility, because you're not going far enough.

20 Wasco gets burned because all of a sudden they
21 don't know what their status is, whether there'll be a
22 station or not.

23 Kings County gets burned, because you haven't
24 been in Kings County to coordinate anything since 2012.
25 But Kings-Tulare Regional Station is built out in an

1 agricultural area, which induces urban sprawl, which is
2 counterpoint to what this project was about.

3 Fresno gets sort of benefited, but at the same
4 token the environmental community gets burned, because your
5 new Business Plan induces sprawl into Fresno County
6 soliciting cheaper housing for people coming from San Jose
7 to live there. It doesn't seem consistent with the Plan.

8 Chowchilla gets burned because you're going to
9 design a wye that doesn't work for their town.

10 Merced gets burned, because while they supported
11 this project whole heartedly they've been omitted based on
12 the Business Plan.

13 San Jose eventually will get there after 50 years
14 of Cap and Trade funds being mortgaged, I guess.

15 San Francisco gets burned because Caltrain
16 doesn't connect to San Francisco. And of course Oakland is
17 out of the picture.

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Oliveira. Can I ask you
19 to just finish up, please?

20 MR. OLIVEIRA: Yes, sir.

21 Will everybody in the State get burned in this
22 Business Plan when you do not, again for the third Business
23 Plan in a row, indicate how much this project will actually
24 cost, full build out, 800 miles.

25 That's required by law, will it be in this

1 Business Plan? Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Oliveira.

3 I have one card that I think was out of order and
4 is it Billy O'Connell, Council Member from Huntington
5 Beach?

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He left, he had to go.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay.

8 Tony (sic) Williams from the Sierra Club, you did
9 speak on the earlier item.

10 DR. WILLIAMS: It's a specific item.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay, if it's specific to this
12 then that's fine.

13 DR. WILLIAMS: Tom.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I'm sorry, I said Tony.
15 Excuse me, it's Tom Williams, thank you. Dr. Tom Williams,
16 sorry, go ahead, sir.

17 DR. WILLIAMS: Good afternoon, Dr. Tom Williams,
18 Sierra Club, Citizens Coalition for a Safe Community and
19 Council Member of the L.A. 32 Neighborhood Council of the
20 City of Los Angeles. Why do I include that? Well, we have
21 our segment of the California High-Speed Rail also.

22 But in general, from say north of Lancaster
23 through Palmdale, under Burbank, to Union Station, put it
24 all underground. One of the issues, have you ever been to
25 New York City? Did you see any rail on the surface in New

1 York City? Have you ever been to London? Did you see any
2 surface rail, commuters, or anything on the surface?
3 Really? Why do we have it on the surface? Because Sierra
4 Club Angeles Chapter Transportation Committee has a phrase,
5 "Get on rail." Sierra Club California supports the
6 California High-Speed Rail. However they allow us to
7 comment on individual segments, so basically from Lancaster
8 under Palmdale, integrating with the Las Vegas group, you
9 can go underground all the way to Union Station.

10 I spent four years of my working life in Union
11 Station when we were building the Red Line Phase 1. And
12 what you guys and MTA are doing to Union Station would
13 never have been done to Downtown New York City, the big
14 railroad station there. You're going to destroy it. We
15 had to protect it for five years, so underground there.

16 You can continue it to underground all the way to
17 the Hobart Rail Yard. There you have plenty of room and
18 it's consistent. On the San Diego line, continue
19 underground to El Monte, because there's good rock there
20 and it's a congested corridor.

21 So basically get on rail, but put it underground.
22 Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

24 John Teal from UltraSystems followed by David
25 Bernal.

1 MR. TEAL: Could I speak to number nine on the
2 agenda, sir? I can wait for that segment, are we on number
3 nine at least?

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Actually we're taking comments
5 on all of the segments right now.

6 MR. TEAL: Oh, you are?

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: But are you Mr. Teal?

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, he's getting his
9 comments.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Thank you, sir.

11 MR. TEAL: Hi, good afternoon. My name is John
12 Teal. I'm an attorney here in Orange County. I represent
13 a company by the name of UltraSystems. And I'm here to
14 urge the Authority to conduct a review of payments to the
15 Authority's prime contractor, STV, during the time period
16 October of 2007 through the end of 2009.

17 Now, you're asking why do I want that to occur?
18 Well, UltraSystems was a subcontractor to STV during this
19 particular time period. The reason that UltraSystems wants
20 a review of these payments to STV is because UltraSystems
21 contends that the Authority failed to timely pay STV's
22 invoices, which meant that under the Government Code they
23 were required to automatically pay Prompt Payment penalties
24 to STV, which would have then gone proportionately to
25 UltraSystems.

1 UltraSystems has been trying for years to get the
2 Authority to go back and review the records and payments
3 during this particular time period. And the California
4 High-speed Rail Authority in November of last year,
5 prepared a Prompt Payment Act follow-up on payments going
6 back all the way to 2012. However they've never done
7 anything to review the payment situation prior to 2012.

8 And consequently, my client is out many, many,
9 many thousands of dollars in Prompt Payment penalties that
10 it should have received through STV. And Betsy Lindsay,
11 the President of UltraSystems, is here and she's going to
12 speak to the economic hardship to her company, because of
13 this situation.

14 I should also point out that UltraSystems is a
15 minority-owned, woman-owned business. The Authority has
16 had a very robust program in recruiting minority-owned
17 businesses to work on this project. By and large, there
18 are companies that don't have a lot of substantial net
19 worth. And consequently, when they're not paid on time it
20 is very, very economically harmful.

21 So the financial problems of the Authority
22 occurred right at the beginning of this project. I
23 personally have tried through Freedom of Information Act
24 requests to get information from the Authority as to what
25 payments were made in the early days of this project. And

1 oddly enough the records don't exist. Or I have been told
2 many times by people there at the California High-Speed
3 Rail Authority that they just don't have the records of
4 what's been paid. Apparently there's a time when the
5 records weren't being -- the finances were being handled by
6 the General Services. And then eventually the High-speed
7 Rail Authority took over. So there's a lot of confusion.

8 I know my time is up, but I just -- again
9 California High-Speed Authority did the right thing, going
10 back reviewing payments that were made. And where they
11 came up short, they made it good. They need to go back
12 further, so that my client can recover the Prompt Payment
13 penalties due.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Teal.

15 David Bernal followed by Steven Bravo.

16 MR. BERNAL: Afternoon, David Bernal, I live in
17 the City of San Fernando.

18 I'm here to kind of talk about some things that
19 haven't really been discussed today. As a resident of the
20 San Fernando Valley we've always been kind of the
21 stepbrother to the City of Los Angeles. We're about 2
22 million people in the San Fernando Valley and this High-
23 Speed Rail Project doesn't even stop there. So why would I
24 want that?

25 You know, it doesn't make any sense for us to

1 have any kind of like a positive influence on a project
2 that we're not even necessarily going to get to use. I
3 think no one has really touched on what I would probably
4 call the busiest stretch of highway in the United States.
5 If you've lived here more than 10 minutes, you know it's
6 the 405. I'm not really sure how this project is going to
7 alleviate the problems on the 405. It really doesn't.

8 Now this high-speed rail thing is great, point to
9 point -- Burbank to Palmdale, vice versa -- that's
10 fantastic. Unfortunately, if you don't work anywhere near
11 one of those stops how do you get to work? So yeah, that's
12 great. You got me here, but now how do I get from -- even
13 from here to the station is three miles. So how does it
14 really benefit? It doesn't for the vast majority of
15 people. I think a light rail system would probably benefit
16 more people than a high-speed rail system just going point
17 to point.

18 The right-of-way costs for this project is really
19 a question mark for everybody sitting up there. No one
20 really knows today, and we don't really know for the
21 foreseeable future, how much it's actually going to cost to
22 do this project, because we have to buy a lot of land from
23 a lot of from a lot of different people. It's not just
24 one person. It's many, many people. And it's basically
25 like you want us to sign off on a blank check for this

1 project. We have no idea how much this is going to cost.
2 Five years ago it was 33 billion, now it's 68, 66? When is
3 it going to stop? Once we start putting shovels in the
4 ground now it's too late and we'll have to finish it. That
5 66 is going to turn into 166 before you know it.

6 So at this time, people have had good ideas about
7 going underground. You know, that's a better alternative,
8 but I don't think that this point-to-point rail system,
9 where the people in between these stops aren't really going
10 to have a real way to use it, it's just not a good thing
11 for us right now. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you Mr. Bernal.

13 Steven Bravo followed by Janet Gibson.

14 MR. BRAVO: Hi, I'd like to propose a new
15 corridor of transportation starting in Bakersfield to
16 Temecula to Edwards Air Force Base. And then the corridor
17 would run then to south to Little Rock over the San Gabriel
18 Pass to Duarte, California, follow the 605 and eventually
19 make it through Long Beach Municipal Airport. This is one
20 corridor of two. The corridor would facilitate also the
21 Metro Union Pacific Train, the high-speed rail, eight lanes
22 of transportation for regular cars, two truck lanes, two
23 diamond lanes, also a frontage road along the freeway in
24 case of any problems. I was asked to for the pass to be
25 called the Pat Brown pass.

1 The second pass would start in San Diego, go
2 through the 15 to the 91 to the 71, to the 210 in San Dimas
3 over the San Gabriel Mountain pass to Pear Blossom, Pear
4 Blossom on to Rosemont, Edwards Air Force Base, Temecula
5 and Bakersfield. My apologies to the San Gabriel
6 Mountains, the animals passes that have to go over these
7 two major corridors should be considered first.

8 We are the oldest city, San Fernando, in the
9 Valley. We were there before this was the United States.
10 In San Fernando we don't see a need for Burbank Airport,
11 because it is way too small. We'd like to see it go to a
12 bigger airport like Long Beach Municipal.

13 Also, when you're going to make the tunnel please
14 be very careful, because there's methane gas. There's
15 water, there's sulfur, there's earthquakes. And if you
16 find any gold, silver, oil or water, we in San Fernando
17 claim it. (Laughter.) And also Acton.

18 Please be very careful of the methane. In
19 Sylmar, when we were digging a water tunnel in the 1970s,
20 we hit a pocket of gas and it killed many of our laborers.
21 I'm a past laborer of Local 300 in Los Angeles and we stand
22 to ready to help you in assistance.

23 The country of Japan offers the newest magnetic
24 levitation train. And they will install it for 50 percent
25 and we cover the other 59 percent.

1 The pass from the 210 -- I'll be off in just a
2 second here -- covers 25 miles to Little Rock. The current
3 pass takes 70 miles to go from Azusa to Little Rock to Pear
4 Blossom. Whoever voted for it, with respect to them, I'd
5 like you to consider who voted for it and perhaps take it
6 through there.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Bravo, I'm going to ask
8 you to conclude your remarks if you would?

9 MR. BRAVO: Yes, sir. Thank you very much.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir. Thank you.

11 Janet Gibson followed by Ralph Hurst.

12 MS. GIBSON: Good afternoon. My name's Janet
13 Gibson, I'm a resident of Sylmar. And you'll notice I'm
14 the only representative of a City of 92,000. Sylmar's not
15 galvanized together such as our neighbors San Fernando,
16 Santa Clarita, Lake View Terrace and Acton. I think part
17 of the reason I'm the only person here from Sylmar is
18 there's been no community outreach there to my knowledge.

19 Sylmar has a unique position by being flanked by
20 both E1 and SR14. Though I completely oppose the entire
21 project, I understand that sometimes we have to pick our
22 battles. And bringing both those lines underground
23 completely would be the lesser of the evils.

24 I have sat here all day and I've listened to
25 several representatives of unions. And one of the

1 gentlemen up here earlier today said something disparaging
2 about NIMBY, those people that don't want it in their
3 backyard. When, when, does the vote of a union outweigh
4 the vote of the community? Not every everybody belongs to
5 a fucking union. We live in this state. We have every
6 right to have as much weight and as much clout as a union
7 leader.

8 That's all I have to say. Please do the right
9 thing. (Applause.)

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Gibson.

11 Ralph Hurst followed by Robin Turner.

12 MR. HURST: Ralph Hurst, I'm a resident of Los
13 Angeles. I was raised on Portland, Oregon. I drive the I-
14 5 Freeway to see my granddaughter in San Francisco.

15 Portland had committed itself to freeways in the
16 '50s and '60s. It was strangled by them. And it took a
17 bold initiative to create a light rail system in that town.
18 The transition was very tough. People fought it. It was
19 horrible. The result is Portland is the most livable city
20 on the West Coast. It's not high-speed rail.

21 What you guys are doing is bold. It is what is
22 necessary. Change is going to happen, whether you like it
23 or not. I really feel for the people whose communities are
24 affected, but they say it won't have anything to do with
25 them. It has everything to do with them. If you do not

1 address the high-speed need, it will come back and get you.

2 And the last thing I say is change is inevitable.
3 Embrace change or change will strangle you. And it will
4 strangle your children. That's all.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

6 Robin Turner followed by Betsy Lindsay

7 MS. TURNER: Hi. I want to just start out by
8 asking this Board -- and I have talked to the old Board
9 since 2007 -- but I want to ask you a quick question. How
10 many of you would sit up here and do this if you hadn't
11 been paid for six months?

12 Now, what I'm actually doing -- think about that.
13 I want to piggyback off of the UltraSystem's attorney on
14 this issue. I have been doing environmental consulting for
15 30 years. And I am politically active. I was a planning
16 commissioner in a local city and I've run several museums.
17 And I'm part of several museums. But what has concerned me
18 is my business almost completely went under, because of the
19 inability of the Authority to cause the project management
20 team, STV, to pay the bills on time. I lost a majority of
21 everything I had.

22 So what I'm actually asking you to do is do the
23 right thing. STV has had -- and they are being -- you're
24 still using them. And yet you're not using the small
25 disadvantaged woman-owned businesses that you actually

1 required when you did this. So you're having them being
2 promoted and doing all this work, where we're the ones that
3 are being punished. So I'm actually asking you to do the
4 right thing, get this blemish away from the Authority and
5 force STV to pay from the Prompt Payment Act the rightful
6 interest payments that they owe us.

7 Now they don't owe me a lot, but I lost an
8 enormous amount, not only personal but business-wise that I
9 will never recover from actually working on the high-speed
10 rail between Anaheim and Los Angeles. I was so happy when
11 I first got the contract. I was in tears with saying, "I
12 get to be part of this." And yet now, I don't want to have
13 anything to do with it, because of the horrible, horrible
14 situation.

15 Now I also want to say that Metro had at one time
16 had -- L.A. Metro had had the same sort of issues. They
17 have a wonderful one-page agreement with every single main,
18 prime contractor that says, "If you have tiered
19 subcontracts you have to pay them in a certain amount of
20 time or..." That's not a little slap on the hand. It's
21 not a, "Let's discuss it." It's they lose that contract
22 and I can be proud to say that I helped on that.

23 And I think that the Authority needs to be
24 proactive and put that into every single prime contractor's
25 packet. But I'd like you to be able to get rid of this

1 blemish and make STV -- I mean, we're not talking much at
2 all, but we need to be paid for our services. So thank
3 you.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, ma'am.

5 Betsy Lindsay followed by Clark Schickler.

6 MS. LINDSAY: Chairman and Members of the Board,
7 thank you for having me here today. I'm Betsy Lindsay.
8 I'm President and CEO of UltraSystems Environmental.

9 I'd like to put things into perspective for you.
10 I've had a business since 1994, so approximately 22 years.
11 I've worked on more than 6,000 environmental projects. I
12 personally have worked on over 400 environmental documents,
13 some of the most complex projects within this region.
14 UltraSystems is a federally-certified DBE firm. We're also
15 a small business and we are also a woman-owned business.

16 I served as a Project Director on the
17 environmental side on your L.A. to Orange County Section of
18 the High-Speed Rail Project from January 2007 through
19 November 2009. I had 22 environmental folks from my firm
20 working on this project. Most of those leads had 20-to-30
21 years of experience, so I'm not here to discuss or debate
22 with you anything regarding that project. I'm here to talk
23 about prompt payment. You're a state agency. You are
24 required by law to pay your contractors in a timely manner.

25 Working under a prime contractor no small

1 business, no woman-owned business, no DBE firm would have
2 taken a contract if we would have assumed that the state
3 agency would not pay its bills on time. Being paid five
4 months, this is after 60-days of processing, or worst case
5 scenario seven months after 60-days of processing,
6 basically meant my team -- not only UltraSystems, but my
7 five sub contractors who worked under me -- did not get
8 paid for five to seven months. We're small business
9 owners.

10 The resulting action of the Authority meant that
11 I became a bank in order to fund one of the largest
12 infrastructure projects in the world. Unfortunately, I am
13 not Morgan Stanley. I'm not Wells Fargo and any other bank
14 that you want to name. But that's what happened.

15 I have people that depend on a paycheck every two
16 weeks. I had to extinguish my lines of credit. I had to
17 borrow against my retirement funds. I basically had to
18 borrow from relatives in order to finance your project.

19 I'm asking you to do what's right. I've been
20 asking this for a very long time from the Authority. I've
21 written to the Authority on multiple occasions, as
22 professional as possible. I believe in transportation
23 projects. I've worked on them. I have 30 on-call
24 contracts with public agencies, so I do a lot of work with
25 public agencies. I know what I'm doing.

1 But I'm asking you, like Robin, to do the right
2 thing. Nine years worth of not being paid on time has
3 accumulated up to \$2.9 million in Prompt Payment Penalties.
4 You're clicking off about \$31,000 a month in Prompt Payment
5 Penalties just for our small contingent of six firms.

6 If our prime contractor, STV, who you awarded
7 this \$50 million contract doesn't feel that they're
8 obligated to pay small businesses, diverse firms, woman-
9 owned businesses, shame on them. It should be an
10 obligation by the prime contractors to ensure that small
11 businesses are being paid timely.

12 If any of you are small business owners, you know
13 what I'm talking about.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Ms. Lindsay, if I might. I've
15 let you go on, because of the importance of what you're
16 saying. I was a small business owner for 15 years, so I do
17 understand what you're saying. I need to --

18 MS. LINDSAY: Wrap it up.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- wrap it up because we have
20 other things to say, but I think I -- I don't know about
21 this issue, so we will have our staff investigate this.

22 MS. LINDSAY: Well, I want to thank all the Board
23 Members and I think you for being here and helping with
24 this situation. But it's not only me, just so you know,
25 during this time period there was 40 contractors, 40 firms.

1 So if you average \$1 million in Prompt Payment Penalties,
2 maybe \$2 million, you're looking at an incurred expense of
3 \$80 million in Prompt Payment Penalties.

4 So I would think somebody, especially legal
5 counsel should be looking at this matter. And take it
6 seriously, please.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: We will.

8 MS. LINDSAY: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Lindsay.

10 Clark Schickler followed by Nina Royal.

11 Mr. Schickler? Mr. Schickler?

12 (No audible response.)

13 Okay. I'll set that aside and call it later.

14 Nina Royal?

15 MS. ROYAL: Set me aside.

16 (Off mic colloquy with attendees regarding who will
17 speak next.)

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. I thought that the
19 cards were handed to me in that order. I'll set it -- does
20 that include Mr. Schickler also? I'm sorry, I see it.

21 Okay, Mr. DePinto. Okay. I have 12 people and
22 Mr. DePinto on that, and then I'll just add these two to
23 the end of that.

24 MR. DEPINTO: Right, I think they were in there.
25 I think we might have (indiscernible) --

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Well, even so these are
2 numbered and the others weren't, so that's fine.

3 MR. DEPINTO: Okay. All right, sorry if there
4 was any confusion on our end.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Dave DePinto.

6 MR. DEPINTO: I'm Dave DePinto, President of the
7 Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, which is in the
8 City of Los Angeles.

9 I first just want to thank all of the communities
10 that have rallied here today. And I think we've
11 demonstrated to everyone here the united feelings
12 throughout our communities and particular about the most
13 damaging aboveground routes. So again, thanks to all of
14 those communities and thanks to the expressions of support
15 from our elected officials.

16 Are you hearing me, okay?

17 SENATOR LOWENTHAL: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes, sir.

19 MR. DEPINTO: Okay. Our communities stand at the
20 gateway of the San Fernando Valley and the Angeles Nation
21 Forest. I'd just quickly call you attention to the big
22 banner over on the right side. Our Big Tujunga Wash is to
23 us what Disneyland means to Anaheim, what beaches mean to
24 Orange County, and what natural areas are important to each
25 of you where you live. It's no place for construction

1 sites, 200-mile-per-hour trains, trestles, bridges,
2 catenaries and tunnel openings. It's sacred. Just look at
3 how beautiful it is.

4 I think Mr. Cameron probably did more to help us
5 here today than any other speaker by talking about the
6 Golden Gate Bridge. And we've heard that analogy many
7 times over the course of this effort. I think that maybe
8 Mr. Cameron might want to ride his horse over the Golden
9 Gate Bridge one of these days.

10 We're the stewards for this area. As one of the
11 speakers earlier mentioned, we live here. We're invested
12 here, so we do have to watch out for it. And we are happy
13 to share our insights and our knowledge with you all. And
14 we've been trying to do that through the input and
15 community outreach process.

16 As Counsel Englander said at the COG meeting a
17 few weeks ago, "Mr. Richard, if you can't mitigate it, it's
18 a show stopper." There is no mitigation for what that
19 would do to the Big Tujunga Wash. We have found common
20 ground here with all other communities on these aboveground
21 routes, and with our elected officials throughout the State
22 of California on these aboveground routes.

23 You can be pro high-speed rail, anti high-speed
24 rail, a fish, a horse, a boomer, a millennial, a union
25 member -- people don't want this. You have to factor that

1 back into your planning as Frank was talking about earlier.

2 We've played by the rules. We've attended all
3 the meetings. We've attended and submitted letters and
4 comments, thousands of them. The Authority right now is
5 disregarding, to a degree, the input of all of the San
6 Fernando Valley residents and elected officials, to remove
7 these aboveground routes. Recent changes to SR14 in
8 particular were welcome and long overdue. But they don't
9 go far enough, and they've left us very frustrated with
10 this process and lacking trust in it as well.

11 We're happy for our friends and neighbors in
12 those communities that have been spared this threat. But
13 there is more work to do.

14 (Timer sounds.) Is that for me?

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yeah. Why don't I give you
16 just a quick minute to try and finish up?

17 MR. DEPINTO: Okay.

18 All right, I'll go right to the meat. Most of
19 what we're going to talk about today is from the letter
20 that we submitted to you all last night. So most of the
21 testimony you're going to hear is going to stick to the
22 letter.

23 I want to say we object to the Refined E2 route
24 being carried forward in the project-level environmental
25 document. And we call on the Board to reject that part of

1 the report and direct staff to remove these damaging
2 aboveground routes now. A simple motion by this Board can
3 make that happen. These aboveground routes are wrong and
4 you can do this today.

5 If you need to work on it further we'll work on
6 it with you. I'll turn this over to our next speaker,
7 okay?

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. DePinto.

9 MR. DEPINTO: Delve into the letter.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay, next is Ms. Cindy Bloom
11 followed by Ms. Patricia Romar. Okay, Cindy Bloom then
12 Patricia Romar then Jackie Gamble.

13 MR. BLOOM: Okay. Good afternoon. Cindy Bloom,
14 Shadow Hills. We do not believe that the Authority is
15 adhering to the its own NEPA/CEQA requirement for a
16 reasonable range of feasible alternatives.

17 With the change of focus by the Authority to a
18 Northern California IOS the added time the Authority has
19 for Southern California studies and removal of the urgency
20 to complete the Southern California IOS by 2022 is now the
21 ideal time for the Authority to immediately remove damaging
22 aboveground elements such as E2 from further consideration,
23 to add new route alternatives for consideration, and to
24 explore a non-Burbank station alternative as the most
25 transparent means of addressing the reasonable range

1 criteria.

2 We object to the Authority continuing to ignore
3 the political and public will in our communities for
4 complete removal of aboveground high-speed trains in
5 residential areas that divide communities or threaten
6 sensitive environmental areas during both construction and
7 operation.

8 It is factually incorrect and disingenuous for
9 the Authority to refer to its public outreach work as
10 intensive or comprehensive where there has been exactly
11 zero such outreach or meetings for 10 months, since the
12 June 2015 Board Meeting in Downtown Los Angeles.

13 In addition, our oft repeated request to be
14 connected to a Board Member responsible for or familiar
15 with our region for detail dialogue has been met with no
16 answers from either the Governor's Office or the Authority.
17 We do not believe it is even possible for the SAA Report to
18 consider the findings of the upfront environmental studies
19 approved unanimously at the Board's June 2015 Meeting as we
20 have documented extensively.

21 First of all, the studies of water, seismic,
22 tunneling and equine were not done independently or
23 collaboratively.

24 Second, two of the studies were raised in the
25 same time period in which readings on the SAA Report were

1 being considered by the Authority. Findings from the
2 studies could not have been incorporated into the SAA
3 Report.

4 Third, there was no public review of the
5 independent third-party studies other than our 11-page
6 critique of the Mineta Equine Study, which we again call
7 upon for the Authority to withdraw from the record due to
8 the obvious conflicts of interest in selecting Mineta for
9 the work given the presence on the Mineta Board of Trustees
10 of at least five current or former Authority employees,
11 board members or contractors.

12 Fourth, the final independent third-party study
13 related to seismic was never even done according to
14 Chairman Richard at the San Fernando Valley COG meeting.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Bloom.

16 Patricia, is it Romar?

17 MS. ROMAR: Yeah, it's Romar.

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes, followed by Jackie
19 Gamble.

20 MS. ROMAR: Patricia Romar, Lake View Terrace.

21 The Authority's April 20016 Supplemental
22 Alternatives Analysis, which proposes the Refined E2
23 Alignment from Palmdale to Burbank is fatally flawed, and
24 Refined E2 like Route E3 should be completely eliminated
25 from consideration. We believe the Authority is abusing

1 its discretion and we continue to find issues, flaws,
2 inadequacies and shortcomings with the Authority's
3 presentations.

4 It was our grassroots group, which pointed out on
5 January 13th, 2015 the water resource risks in the San
6 Gabriel Mountains, of which the Authority was not aware.
7 Then in fall 2015 we hosted Authority staff and consultants
8 on a tour of the Big Tujunga Mitigation Area and wrote
9 exhaustively for many months convincing the Authority of
10 the fatal flaws and showstoppers inherent in constructing
11 and operating the High-Speed Train Project in or near the
12 sensitive environmental areas such as Big Tujunga Wash
13 Mitigation Area, Haines Canyon Creek, and the Tujunga
14 Mitigation Ponds.

15 We find the Authority's response of moving the
16 Refined E2 Route several hundred yards west of the
17 political boundary of the Big Tujunga Wash Mitigation Area
18 to be inconsequential from an overall environmental and
19 impact standpoint.

20 The E2 Route remains offensive and injurious in
21 countless environmental categories as well as its
22 cumulative impacts.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Romar.

24 Jackie, is it Gamble?

25 MS. GAMBLE: It's Gamble, Las Vegas.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes, I'm sorry, ma'am.

2 MS. GAMBLE: First, I wanted to note that
3 Mr. Cameron who spoke earlier could not be further off the
4 base of anything. The Hansen Dam will never be a desert.
5 It offers the best sustainable water supply and park zone
6 in all of Los Angeles. It's got a huge big watershed, an
7 amazing amount of water comes through there, and that's our
8 best hope for a sustainable water supply. And I speak that
9 as a water and soil scientist, but onward.

10 We will next present seven concepts that outline
11 clear and compelling reasons for the elimination of the
12 Route E2 that will include contradictions of the
13 Authority's analysis of reasons for eliminating the Revised
14 E3 that are not equally applied to the Revised E2.

15 The first item is called overburden, which to the
16 rest of you people out here generally means the depth to
17 tunnel. The recent SAA states that the reducing overburden
18 is the key factor of evaluating overall constructability
19 and cost. In attempting to refine the E3 Route the
20 Authority was able to reduce the E3 overburden from 3,000
21 feet down to 2,750 feet. As the Authority states on page
22 71, "Deep tunnel construction would have posed a higher
23 risk to feasibility." This is still one of the main
24 reasons for eliminating the E3 Route.

25 The Authority makes the unsubstantiated statement

1 that a 2,750 foot overburden is still greater than the
2 Refined E2 Route. However, nowhere in the recent SAA or
3 the previous SAA is there a chart or a graph showing the E2
4 overburden. The only reference to this overburden is
5 located on Table A3 on page appendix 28, which says the
6 same as the constructability for prior iterations of E2.
7 In prior portions of these tables, Table A1 and A2,
8 constructability refers to the overburden -- this pursuant
9 to the most recent SAA, the overburden for the E2 is the
10 same as the overburden for the prior E2, either E2A or E2B.

11 We, the S.A.F.E group, were able to locate a
12 document by the Authority, written by you guys, which shows
13 the E2 overburden. While it didn't give an exact number of
14 that overburden, the graph shows two points where this
15 amount is greater than or equal to 2,2750 feet. Thus,
16 since this overburden is a key factor that disqualifies E3
17 the identical overburden must also disqualify the refined
18 E2.

19 And of course, you know this may also disqualify
20 E1, but again there are no figures for us to evaluate what
21 that overburden is.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay.

23 MS. GAMBLE: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Gamble.

25 Clark Schickler, I found two cards so that's why

1 I said Mr. Schickler followed by Lois Dayen.

2 MR. SCHICKLER: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and
3 Board Members. My name is Clark Schickler, I'm from Lake
4 View Terrace and I have the second reason to remove E2. It
5 concerns the operational capability and travel time.

6 The Authority states that it was concerned about
7 the original E3 operational capability and travel time,
8 which were of particular concern in the Burbank Station
9 area, because of the relative tight curves into and out of
10 the station platform reducing maximum travel speeds and
11 thus increasing overall travel time.

12 The Authority stated that it modified such entry
13 for E3 much like it modified the Refined E2 Route entering
14 Burbank. E3 Route to Burbank still led to its elimination
15 and the Refined E2 Route should be eliminated for the same
16 reason.

17 And on a personal note, I live on Upper Wheatland
18 Avenue where you've just moved E2. I'm 68 years old and
19 not going to move. Our house belongs to my wife and me,
20 not the State of California, it's not for sale. I will not
21 move nor will I surrender my home to anyone. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

23 Lois Dayen followed by Nina Royal.

24 MS. L. DAYEN: Lois Dayen, Shadow Hills resident.
25 I'm going to be giving you reason number three and four of

1 the reasons to remove the E2 Route.

2 Number three, contaminated soil and groundwater
3 in the vicinity of Burbank. One of the reasons for
4 eliminating E3 was the known presence of contaminated soils
5 and groundwater in the vicinity of the Burbank Station. It
6 is well know that substantial portions of the Burbank site
7 area are designated Superfund sites due to toxic solvents
8 deposited in to the soil. This contamination, not only the
9 ground, but hexavalent chromium, has contaminated portions
10 of the water supply.

11 Routes E3 and Refined E2 both enter Burbank
12 through the same tunnel Superfund site with the same
13 predictable disqualifying results. The Refined E2
14 Alternative should be withdrawn for the same contaminated
15 soil and groundwater issues, which disqualified E3.

16 Reasons number four, environmental resources.
17 The Refined E3 Route impacts on environmental resource
18 compared with the E2A and E2B Routes; are almost identical
19 in the case of critical habitats for the federally-
20 endangered Santa Ana Sucker and the Southern Willow
21 Flycatcher.

22 The Refined E2 Alignment disrupts an even greater
23 number of critical habitat acres. As it crosses the Big
24 Tujunga Wash, the Refined E2 Route is just as
25 environmentally disruptive as it was to the prior E2 routes

1 and more disruptive than the E3 Routes. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

3 Nina Royal followed by Sue Mansis.

4 MS. ROYAL: Good afternoon, I'm Nina Royal. I'm
5 with the Sunland-Tujunga Neighborhood Council Board, a
6 member of the Saving Angeles Forest for Everyone Committee.
7 And I'm going to talk about the mitigation bank.

8 The County of Los Angeles owns approximately 206
9 acres as a mitigation bank in the Big Tujunga Wash to
10 offset other activities in the Department of Public Works.
11 The former E2 routes went through this mitigation bank
12 aboveground. The Refined E2 Route is moved several hundred
13 yards to the west, so that it no longer goes through the
14 county-owned mitigation bank. But instead goes through the
15 ACOE, which is the Army Corps of Engineers property.

16 That property has the identical environmental
17 territory characteristics as the mitigation bank property
18 and will yield identically adverse environmental impacts.
19 The mere move of a few hundred yards west is no reason for
20 the Authority to be touting that change adds any kind of
21 environmental improvement. It is simply a geographic or
22 political convenience for the Authority and has no benefits
23 to our precious Big Tujunga Wash.

24 The Haines Canyon Creek with its endangered Santa
25 Ana Sucker and every place it will habitat does not stop at

1 the property line. It continues to into the Army Corps
2 property. Moving the aboveground train 200 or so yards
3 downstream is akin to rearranging the environmental deck
4 chairs of the Titanic.

5 Further details and environmental issues can be
6 found in the Hansen Dam Master Plan prepared by the Army
7 Corps, which is available online and the existence of which
8 has been provided to the High-Speed Rail on numerous
9 occasions. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, ma'am.

11 Sue Mansis followed by Katherine Dayen.

12 MS. MANSIS: I know it's been a long day, but I
13 appreciate your attention span. We are really literally
14 fighting for our lives here.

15 I'm going to be bringing you reason number six
16 for the removal of E2. We feel that there was a
17 disingenuous argument by Chairman Richard. This is no
18 personal attack, but we do feel like this is a very
19 important point.

20 On several occasions including at the COG Meeting
21 in San Fernando Valley and also on the Channel 4 News
22 broadcast on April 10th, Chairman Richard attempted to
23 justify the Refined E2 Alignment aboveground through the
24 Big Tujunga Wash by pointing to, and attempting to equate
25 the electrical transmission lines which cross the Big

1 Tujunga Wash, with the proposed Authority's viaduct. In
2 fact, Mr. Richard referred to a solitary power structure as
3 the evidence of, "stuff." That was his word, that he used,
4 that would somehow justify this pristine ecosystem as a
5 proper location for the massive high-speed train impacts.
6 These two cannot be equated however.

7 The high-tension power lines have one tower in
8 the middle of a two-mile wide Big Tujunga Wash. That tower
9 is in an area that does not contain wetlands. On the other
10 hand, the Authority's viaduct appears to require structures
11 every 25-to-100 yards. These structures will destroy the
12 wetlands, which they encounter.

13 The five-year plus construction phase alone,
14 given the intrusion of boring equipment, trucks, materials,
15 supplies, the closure of trails and roads and also
16 displacements, would cause irreparable damage to this area.
17 To equate the one electrical transmission line tower with
18 multiple structures that are needed to support the trains
19 is disingenuous. And we feel that even the casual observer
20 would be questioning the efficacy of all these Authority
21 statements.

22 It should be noted that the City of L.A. is
23 spending millions to restore the Los Angeles River at the
24 same time the Authority is spending billions to seemingly
25 destroy it. The Big Tujunga Wash is the Los Angeles River

1 before cement. The LADWP owns the water rights to the
2 Haines Canyon Creek, which is part of the Wash and that
3 creek is a contributor to the City's water supply,
4 especially in these dire drought conditions. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Mansis.

6 Katherine Dayen followed by Bill Eick, I believe
7 it is.

8 MS. K. DAYEN: Good afternoon, Chairman Richard
9 and the Board. My name is Katherine Dayen. I'm a resident
10 of Shadow Hills. I'm also on the SHPOA Board and a member
11 of the S.A.F.E Coalition and I'm proud to be here with my
12 community residents and members to fight for our area. I'm
13 going to give you Reason Number Seven for the elimination
14 of the E2 Route, the non-Burbank Route.

15 Jeff Morales, you yourself stated on Monday April
16 4th that higher costs were driven by the assumption that a
17 rail station would be built in Burbank rather than Sylmar.
18 In fact, the ballot initiative did not even mention Burbank
19 as a station. A non-Burbank station alternative should not
20 only be considered as one of the feasible environmental
21 alternatives, such a route would reduce project costs by
22 millions if not billions of dollars.

23 The Authority's claim that Burbank is needed for
24 connectivity purposes is pandering to a political audience
25 and is redundant to present and future rail options at the

1 Burbank Airport.

2 Further, as an Assembly Budget Subcommittee
3 Oversight meeting on Wednesday April 6th, Mr. Richard, you
4 touted the enormous development opportunities in station
5 communities. Neither the residents of Burbank, the City of
6 Burbank, or we as neighboring residents, would favor such
7 an enormous development and the stress that it would put on
8 existing infrastructures and communities.

9 Inserting Burbank as a station, not only
10 increases the costs, but also requires some of the most
11 troublesome route alternatives. The Authority should
12 please take the time to study alternatives, which do not
13 have a Burbank station. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, ma'am.

15 Bill Eick followed by, I hope I pronounce it
16 correctly, is it Cile Borman?

17 Mr. Eick?

18 MR. EICK: Cile Borman. Yes, my name --

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Cile, I'm sorry, go ahead,
20 sir.

21 MR. EICK: That's okay. My name's Bill Eick. I
22 live in Shadow Hills. I'm the Land Use Chairman of the
23 Property Owners Association and a member of numerous
24 organizations.

25 I'm going to kind of try and wrap this up. The

1 April SAA Report eliminated Route E3, which is to the east.
2 The reasons given for that included excessive overburden,
3 access to Burbank through contaminated soil -- you know, C6
4 hexavalent chromium -- I think Erin Brokovich. Basically
5 you're tunneling under that stuff and through it, so then
6 the question is if you eliminate E3 why aren't you
7 eliminating E2, which has the same concerns. Actually, we
8 have greater concerns, but those are the ones that are
9 similar.

10 You eliminate E3, why don't you eliminate refined
11 E2? There's no reason not to do that. It's actually an
12 abuse of discretion and I'm an attorney, I use those words
13 carefully, okay? It's an abuse of discretion to continue
14 to use Refined E2 in this process.

15 By the way, Mr. Cameron, when he said that the
16 Hansen Dam used to be a gravel pit? He so does not
17 understand that in 1960 the California Supreme Court
18 actually rendered an opinion prohibiting sand and gravel
19 mining in the Big Tujunga Wash much to the chagrin of
20 CalNAP. (phonetic) But there was no sand and gravel mining
21 there, it was actually prohibited. So among other things
22 that's another thing that he doesn't actually understand.

23 I would suggest also that now would be a good
24 time to think of a non-Burbank alternative. It's not
25 required by the Proposition. It's not required by anything

1 as a matter of law and if you think it's actually going to
2 cost less to have a non-Burbank alternative then now would
3 be the time to think about it. Because what's going
4 through to Burbank is actually the only reason that you
5 have to do Route E2 or E3, because that's what you have to
6 do to get to Burbank.

7 You can use any other alternatives, a lot of
8 different alternatives if you're not at Burbank. I don't
9 know, think about it. You have lots of time. If you're
10 moving everything north you have lots of time to figure out
11 how to get south.

12 And I want to thank Mr. Rossi, by the way, for
13 his pointed important questions with respect to the
14 spending of money earlier in this discussion. And I would
15 just urge, at some point and time, that we could have that
16 same discussion with respect to the SAA and the
17 environmental impacts related to the Refined E2.

18 Thank you very much and I appreciate your time.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Eick.

20 Ms. Borman, I think I mispronounced your first
21 name, is it Seal? (phonetic) Ms. Borman, welcome.

22 MS. BORMAN: Thank you. My name is Cile Borman,
23 I'm a musician.

24 (Singing) "Cowboys and accountants, housewives
25 and movie stars, people of every race and every creed share

1 mornings in the country with the city in the distance.

2 This is Lake View Terrace yes indeed."

3 According the Department of Social Justice low-
4 income communities are burdened with undesirable businesses
5 and projects. I've been told that HSR doesn't want to
6 divide working-class communities or overburden them with
7 projects such as HSR route that's dividing communities say
8 of like San Fernando and Pacoima and have been removed.
9 Their routes have been removed from that area, that they
10 were being considered to go through these communities.

11 Route E2 through Lake View Terrace where I live
12 is still being considered although we share the same
13 demographics as Pacoima and San Fernando. I wish the
14 unions would unite behind bringing -- the unions big
15 business and our government would behind bringing
16 businesses that were sent overseas back to the USA to
17 supply work for our low-income and blue collar workers.
18 And the millennials will still be paying for the train in
19 the future, but will the train provide all the jobs
20 necessary to make these payments? Who will repair the
21 damage done to the communities like Lake View Terrace?

22 (Singing) "Lake View Terrace, a very special
23 place where you can see lots of nature's little secrets.
24 And if you take the time, you'll be amazed at what you
25 find."

1 Thank you. (Applause.)

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, ma'am.

3 Fritz Bronner followed by Keith Harkey.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Fritz Bronner is not here.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Keith Harkey was here
6 this morning? I don't know if Mr. Harkey is still here?
7 Mike Hernandez? Marvin Dean, did you want to speak on this
8 item as well? No. And we have Jean Fernandez from Sylmar?

9 MS. FERNANDEZ: It's Joanne.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: It is Joanne, I apologize.

11 MS. FERNANDEZ: Shall I go up now?

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes, please. Just because I
13 mispronounced your name doesn't mean you lose your right to
14 speak. (Laughter.)

15 And then following Ms. Fernandez is Mary Mendoza.

16 Thank you, ma'am.

17 MS. FERNANDEZ: Thank you, good afternoon. As
18 the gentleman stated I'm Joanne Fernandez, former Mayor of
19 the City of San Fernando and a lifelong resident of the
20 Northeast San Fernando Valley.

21 The San Fernando Valley is the home of the 5, the
22 210, the 118, the 404 and the 14 Freeway. This condition
23 emits a disproportionate amount of CO2 into our community's
24 air. And the speed rail, will contribute yet another layer
25 of negative environmental impact. We are against

1 aboveground routes near residential and sensitive
2 environmental areas. And ask that you omit routes that
3 deteriorate our now rare, natural spaces.

4 As taxpayers and voters, we petition this Board
5 to follow state policy, which requires regular timely
6 public meetings with adequate notification to all
7 residents. We petition you for an opportunity to voice our
8 impact before the SAA Report is accepted or acted upon by
9 this Board. We thank you for helping us work through this
10 process as we all know that it's been very emotional, very
11 difficult and very time consuming. And we call on you as
12 appointed voices to be our representation of voices.
13 Please do this for our children, for our neighborhood that
14 is so often overlooked, but looked at as some place that
15 they can railroad things through.

16 We just ask that you would be our voices now and
17 make sure that you take care of us. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Fernandez.

19 Mary Mendoza followed by Josephine Zarate.

20 Ms. Mendoza? Ms. Zarate? Yes, please come
21 forward.

22 MS. ZARATE: Good afternoon, my name is Josephine
23 Zarate. I'm from Lake View Terrace, but before I continue
24 I want to tell you something. I've been to many hearings
25 in different cities, but this time most of you are

1 entertained by different -- I don't know -- you have
2 responsibilities and personal issues and you don't pay
3 attention to the people. Not you, I'm talking about other
4 groups. They don't pay attention to whatever is actually
5 brought to them. You are going to be my model to tell the
6 people when I go back to my city that we were listened to,
7 because I see all of you. You're not entertained with your
8 cell phones. You're not talking to each other. You're not
9 turning your back at us. I appreciate that and I'm going
10 to tell all my people, to everyone to come back here, that
11 you will listen to us.

12 Myself, I appreciate that very hard, because we
13 come from a long ways. We have to get up early, get
14 together, take care of our families and then be here, so
15 you can listen to us. Thank you so very much.

16 Moving forward I want to tell you that Mr.
17 Garcetti, Mayor Garcetti and Mr. Fuentes do not have my
18 back, does not have our back in Lake View Terrace. They're
19 not listening to us, because they are not working with us
20 at all one way or the other. And they're going for this
21 project saying that we want to -- support the project.
22 Lake View Terrace and the surrounding communities do not
23 support this project. Everybody else has said everything
24 that needs to be said about this project.

25 I can tell you, the people in Lake View Terrace

1 that I talk to, do not support this project, do not want
2 this project, do not our tax money to go into a project
3 like that, because it will destroy our community.

4 If this project was clear, crystal clear, I think
5 most of us would get together and work with the entity that
6 is representing the project. But like everybody has said
7 before there is nothing crystal clear about this. There is
8 wishy-washy, there is nothing but no communication.

9 There's people that said they're going to do one thing then
10 they change their mind and do something. They don't meet
11 with us. Rather than doing this, we, Mr. DePinto and a lot
12 of people have to find out what is going on.

13 And even at that time we don't get all that
14 information. How do you want us to accept a project like
15 that when you are not making us a part of your project?
16 You're fighting us, you're going against what we want in
17 our community. I don't think that's right.

18 And talking about the Hansen Dam and other
19 ranches in Lake View Terrace if you ever have the chance I
20 invite you to come over and see what we have. That is the
21 last rural area in the Northeast Valley. If they put a
22 high-speed rail around the area it will destroy what is
23 left of the Northeast Valley.

24 And about this is going to be a benefit to us? I
25 can tell you, I don't care how you look at it, it is not a

1 benefit to us. It may benefit other people, but not Lake
2 View Terrace and the surrounding communities.

3 Thank you so very much for your time.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, ma'am.

5 Do we have other speakers?

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have one last lady in
7 the audience.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay, because I had come
9 through the end of the list. Thank you.

10 Okay. Yes, is it Gerri Sumne or Summe? Thank
11 you.

12 MS. SUMME: Hi, it's Summe rhymes with tummy and
13 I had a migraine. I appreciate your accepting my late
14 card, anyway.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Oh, no problem.

16 MS. SUMME: Hi, Chairman Richard and the Board.
17 My name is Gerri Summe and some of your faces are familiar
18 to me by now.

19 First I want to mention that I fully support the
20 letter written by our attorney, Bill Eick, and I encourage
21 you to give it your closest consideration. I have been a
22 patient resident of the City of Los Angeles and I hope that
23 you'll forgive my emotion today as I am frustrated. I
24 attended the first (indiscernible) meeting in Burbank back
25 in 2014 and was granted a position in the Community

1 Workshop Committee for Shadow Hills with High-Speed Rail.

2 And I'm here to tell you with all due respect
3 this SAA Report is a piece of garbage. That said, I
4 reached page 3 in the introductory pages, which states --
5 and I quote -- "The approximate 35-to-45 mile section has
6 multiple alignment options under study and will tunnel
7 under the San Gabriel Mountains." What part of "safe" did
8 you not understand? "Safe Angeles Forest for Everyone."

9 While I am happy for the citizens of San Fernando
10 and Santa Clarita I would contend that a no-build option is
11 better than any option currently on the table, but your
12 jobs being dependent on the continuance of this fiscally
13 irresponsible circus means that the no-build option and the
14 loss of salaries would clearly not be in your own best
15 interests.

16 So far this Authority has said, "Screw the
17 environment, screw President Obama and his national
18 monument. Screw one of the last remaining water supplies
19 in Los Angeles. Screw the mountains lions, bears and all
20 the animals who have no voice and were unable to attend
21 this meeting today. Screw the Tujunga Wash and its
22 endangered species." Screw the people who have tried to
23 talk logic with you for two years, but there is no logic
24 here.

25 This train is a fiscal disaster. You should have

1 never been allowed to break ground anywhere until you had
2 full technical and environmental approval for the entire
3 route, so you would actually know where you were going. I
4 was told by one of your consultants that doing so would be
5 too expensive. So instead, you are destroying people's
6 lives, their livelihood and their property in advance of
7 knowing whether you have even the money or the ability to
8 finish this train.

9 And with all due respect to the fine town and
10 people of Shafter, you are building a train to nowhere that
11 in all likelihood will never be completed. And I think
12 this Board knows that by the time this train is completed
13 it will be a dinosaur. And I believe this Board knows
14 that. So I feel like we are just churning salaries until
15 Governor Brown gets out of office.

16 And, you know, I sometimes wonder if Jerry Brown
17 must have a staffer here or someone who has his ear.
18 Jerry, this is the other Gerri, and I'm here to tell you
19 that your legacy is (indiscernible) this stupid train that
20 will never have sufficient ridership to support itself.
21 Your legacy should be water. There is not money for both.
22 It's time to get back to the drawing board, get rid of E2,
23 and find a more feasible way to enter Los Angeles.

24 Thank you very much.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Summe.

1 (Applause.)

2 So that concludes the public comment period for
3 Session II. We do have a presentation by Ms. Boehm about
4 the Supplemental Alternatives Analysis. But just before we
5 turn it over to her I would like to just say two things.

6 First of all, I would like to thank all of the
7 citizens who came out today to speak to us. This is a very
8 serious matter and we do understand that this is a cause
9 for great concern in your communities.

10 I also want to compliment the citizens who
11 organized their presentation to clearly lay out issues that
12 they felt that we needed to hear. I appreciated the next
13 to the last speaker, because I sensed from all of my
14 colleagues that we were listening intently to what you had
15 to say.

16 And let me also add a personal note, having spent
17 a day in the area of Sunland, Tujunga, Lake View Terrace,
18 Shadow Hills and in going around there I certainly did not
19 mean in my comments the other day, to indicate anything
20 that was disparaging. I think if you check back on the
21 tape I also said in that same television interview that if
22 we cannot mitigate issues then we have to select different
23 routes.

24 So we are going to be as sensitive as we can to
25 these issues. And I just think the main thing I want to

1 say to the citizens who took an entire day of their lives
2 to come and see us today in addition to whatever time you
3 spent preparing, that we appreciate your comments and that
4 we listened to them. We'll continue to work to try to
5 resolve these issues to the best of our ability.

6 So I want to thank you for that. (Applause.)

7 So Ms. Boehm, if you could quickly given the
8 lateness of the hour, and I think people would like to see
9 the presentation, but we also know that the roads get
10 somewhat later in the afternoon here. So...

11 MS. BOEHM: You've heard.

12 Good afternoon, Chairman Richard, Vice Chair
13 Richards, Board Members, CEO Morales. I'm here today to
14 present information items on items six, seven, eight, nine
15 and ten. Six, seven, eight and nine are recaps of the
16 Supplemental Alternative Analyses documents that have been
17 posted for our Phase 1 sections in Southern California.
18 Item ten is an update on our Los Angeles to San Diego
19 section, which is a Phase 2 item.

20 Here on the map you can see the alignments that
21 make up the Southern California section of the High-Speed
22 Rail Project. We have about 330 total miles of the project
23 here in the Southern California section. You can see here
24 the four alignments from Bakersfield to Anaheim that make
25 up our Phase 1 section and in yellow on this map our Phase

1 2 section, Los Angeles to San Diego. We are working very,
2 very hard on this section here to bring high-speed rail to
3 the 22 million people that call Southern California home.
4 This project is being designed to address many key
5 statewide issues including congestion, future economic
6 development, reduction of greenhouse gases and many of
7 those issues.

8 We are working hard to connect Southern
9 California. Right now we do not have a steel rail
10 passenger connection to Southern California. You cannot
11 take a train across the Tehachapis to Bakersfield, so we
12 are isolated in Southern California in the Central Valley.

13 We are working on several key efforts down here
14 in Southern California including to make Phase 1 shovel-
15 ready in accordance with the 2016 Draft Business Plan
16 principles. We want to deliver early benefits and
17 connectivity and bookend projects. We want to compliment
18 the statewide rail modernization efforts that are led by
19 the State of California. And we want to make sure that we
20 are multiplying the benefits of the investment in this
21 program.

22 We have already started, the High-Speed Rail
23 Authority has already started these investments in Southern
24 California. And you can see here on this slide some of
25 those projects. The State released money through the

1 Connectivity Funds, which have gone to projects in Southern
2 California including the Regional Connector Project, which
3 connects all of the light rail services in Southern
4 California or in L.A. County. Money to Metrolink to put in
5 positive train control to increase the safety as well as to
6 purchase new locomotives -- those Tier 4 locomotives reduce
7 greenhouse gas emissions by about 80 percent over the
8 current stock that they're running.

9 We're also looking with our regional partners, as
10 was mentioned earlier today in some of the comments, on
11 bookend projects in Southern California that would include
12 dramatic modernization of Los Angeles Union Station, so
13 that it can really meet the needs of the 21st Century as
14 well as grade-separation projects up and down our existing
15 rail corridors. These are the types of projects that not
16 only benefit our passenger rail, but would have a dramatic
17 benefit and improvement to our goods movement as well.

18 Our Phase 1 sections in Southern California are
19 broken up roughly into the way that we look at it, getting
20 to Southern California, so from Kern County at the
21 outskirts of Bakersfield getting into the San Fernando
22 Valley where we have many of our technical challenges.
23 Getting over two mountain ranges, closing that existing
24 rail gap across the Tehachapi where we're running alongside
25 the existing corridor, modernizing and making those

1 corridors more safe, making sure that we can get across
2 those mountain ranges in the most efficient way possible,
3 and setting the stage for interstate connectivity as well
4 as community connections at some of our major station
5 locations.

6 So this is the connection to Las Vegas in the
7 Antelope Valley as well as station area planning in the
8 communities of Palmdale and Burbank to make sure that we're
9 looking at them, identifying the opportunities that could
10 be there for them and high-speed rail; and making sure that
11 they have the opportunity to select the right opportunities
12 in those communities.

13 So now we'll start with the Bakersfield to
14 Palmdale Project Section. It is a 75-to-80 mile section
15 depending on which of the alternatives is ultimately
16 selected. As mentioned it closes a passenger rail gap
17 between Southern California and the Central Valley. It has
18 stations at each end and there are a lot of very, very
19 dramatic terrain that it goes through whether it be the
20 school area and agricultural area in the Edison community
21 in Kern County, coming across the Tehachapis to some of our
22 largest conservation areas in that particular area. Coming
23 down the south side of the Tehachapis where we have some of
24 the major green energy generation in the State of
25 California including both wind and solar, and then coming

1 through the rest of the Antelope Valley to get to the
2 Palmdale Station area.

3 This is very, very difficult and we've heard that
4 today and that is no surprise. When you're planning a
5 project of this magnitude there are so many things to take
6 into consideration. And as we have progressed through this
7 we have had conversations and we have progressed. We are
8 improving as we move through space and time. We have not
9 addressed every issue along these routes, but we have
10 addressed many issues and we have made progress.

11 You can see that here on this slide, the progress
12 that we've made in the Bakersfield to Palmdale section. In
13 2010 you can see that the alignment was a little bit
14 further to the east and it's moved successively to the west
15 up to 2016 today. That was to address many, many similar
16 issues that you've heard talked about today whether it
17 would be the proximity of schools, the proximity of
18 businesses, the grades of the crossing, the green energy
19 generation, many, many features led to these refinements.
20 And there is still more to learn and more to do as we move
21 forward.

22 Here basically our SAA discusses that we will
23 continue to study four alignments moving forward to reduce
24 many of the impacts as noted previously.

25 Here is a list of some of the recent stakeholder

1 and community discussions that we've had on the Bakersfield
2 to Palmdale section. You can see that we've had over 150
3 meetings whether they be one-on-one meetings or broad
4 public meetings. We are out and about gathering
5 information, so that we continue to improve our routes.

6 Here is the timeline for Bakersfield to Palmdale.
7 We are here in April of 2016 where we have completed the
8 most recent Supplemental Alternative Analysis and we're
9 discussing that today. We will continue through the
10 process to study -- through the environmental process to
11 study it. And in the winter of 2016-17 we would be
12 identifying a preliminary preferred alternative that would
13 be incorporated into the draft environmental document in
14 the spring of 2017, moving forward to a completion of that
15 document in winter of 2017.

16 This schedule is going to be very similar for all
17 of the Phase 1 sections, so I won't go over it in detail.

18 Palmdale to Burbank, again some challenging
19 geography, very, very diverse communities, 35-to-45 mile
20 section connecting into the San Fernando Valley with
21 stations at each end -- again, Palmdale in the north,
22 Burbank in the south. I talked a little bit about station
23 area planning there.

24 Again, you can see the list of key
25 considerations: the high desert communities, the mountain

1 and open space, the rural and equestrian communities,
2 suburban communities, going into the dense urban areas.

3 You can see here that we have had a lot of
4 activity on this section over the course of the last
5 several years. And again, you know every time we come up
6 with a route we test it. We go out, we talk to folks about
7 it, we study it and we evolve over time and improve the
8 routes. We have not addressed every issue yet, but we have
9 addressed many issues to date and we are committed to
10 continuing that process.

11 Here are the routes that we are proposing to
12 study in the future. You can see in the gray here where
13 the previous routes and the bright colors are the three
14 routes that we will be studying moving forward. And you
15 can see here the list of things that these routes did do,
16 and again as I mentioned everything has not been addressed,
17 but many things have been addressed.

18 Here is a list of all of the recent stakeholder
19 activities and engagement that we've done over the course
20 of the last several years. Over 220 meetings, again one-
21 one-one, stakeholder, small focus groups, large broad
22 public meetings, in order to talk to folks and get
23 information, so that we can make the improvements we talked
24 about.

25 Here again, the key timeline for this, very

1 similar to the Bakersfield to Palmdale Alignment, so I
2 won't go over it in depth.

3 Now, at Burbank going down to Anaheim we have
4 getting through the urban area to the southern terminus.
5 This is where it is a job where we are modernizing the
6 existing rail corridor. We will be utilizing the existing
7 passenger and freight corridor from Burbank down to
8 Anaheim. By bringing high-speed rail into this corridor
9 we're able to provide major safety improvements within that
10 corridor as we bring high-speed rail ultimately to Southern
11 California.

12 And we have several principles including the fact
13 that we want to maximize the use of this corridor and the
14 right-of-way already in that corridor, to keep high-speed
15 rail within it to the extent possible. And then take
16 advantage of bringing high-speed there to provide fencing
17 and intrusion barriers around the outside of the corridor,
18 so people can't get in the corridor, get in front of
19 trains, leave litter and graffiti along these corridors.
20 And automate these corridors with full safety features, so
21 that all trains operate more safely within the corridors.

22 The first piece of this is Burbank to Los Angeles
23 Union Station. This is the shortest piece that we're
24 working on here in Southern California. It's approximately
25 12 miles long, again with a station at both ends. And the

1 vision to improve the operational characteristics for both
2 passenger and freight services as we bring high-speed rail
3 to this corridor. This is a corridor as well we're can do
4 some early activities including the Duran Street Grade
5 Separation Project, which is under evaluation right now.
6 And we hope to be able to get that into construction very
7 soon, because of the safety challenges that that presents
8 to the local community.

9 Here is a map basically of the Burbank Airport to
10 Los Angeles Union Station and you can see some of the major
11 connecting transit routes to this location, and really the
12 importance of being able to bring high-speed rail in here
13 and connect to all of the other transportation services.

14 Moving forward we will be carrying through the
15 environmental process, the sharing of the corridor that I
16 discussed in order to minimize the right-of-way impacts and
17 maximize the benefits of the investment of high-speed rail
18 into this corridor.

19 Here is a list of all of the meetings we've had
20 over the last several months up to a year: 100 meetings
21 again, one-on-one, community organizations, neighborhood
22 councils, broad public meetings as we move through the
23 process. Importantly in this corridor at our different
24 meetings we have up to nine languages that are translated
25 for the folks who attend.

1 Again, a similar timeline to the other projects
2 with a completion of the environmental document in winter
3 of 2017.

4 And Los Angeles to Anaheim, the final southern
5 piece of the Phase 1 system, it's about 30 miles from Los
6 Angeles County to Orange County. There are at least three
7 stations in this location: Los Angeles Union Station at one
8 end, ARTIC which is of course already built at the end, and
9 then we have been evaluating mid-point stations at Norwalk,
10 Santa Fe Springs, and at Fullerton.

11 And both of these stations have broad mobility
12 ramifications for Southern California. At the Fullerton
13 location we have the opportunity to connect to the Inland
14 Empire and trains coming out of there. And at Norwalk-
15 Santa Fe Springs we have a future opportunity to connect
16 with transit directly, potentially to LAX along with direct
17 connectivity to the existing Metrolink service. So very,
18 very exciting connections in both places, again this is the
19 urban corridor. This is the key urban goods movement
20 corridor. This is where BNSF brings the majority of their
21 freight up to Hobart Yard. And so it is critical for the
22 Southern California economy, but it's also very, very
23 important that we make sure that these corridors are safe
24 and that they are good neighbors. And those are things
25 that bringing high-speed rail into this corridor can help

1 us with.

2 Here is the map of that corridor showing the
3 variety of different transportation connectivity at station
4 locations, both at the high-speed rail station locations
5 and at Metrolink station locations, which are shown there
6 in light gray.

7 Moving forward, again our plan here is to study a
8 corridor modernization approach to bringing high-speed rail
9 to Anaheim in order to reduce the impacts and the right-of-
10 way required to bring high-speed rail. And to bring
11 immediate benefits as well. Several of the projects in
12 this corridor are candidates for early action as well. In
13 L.A. County we have the Rosecrans/Marquardt Grade
14 Separation Project, which we hope to get under construction
15 in the next year or so. And in Orange County we have the
16 State College Grade Separation Project, which we will be
17 environmentally clearing with our environmental document in
18 order to support our local partners and benefit them in
19 that way.

20 Here is the list of meetings that we have had in
21 this corridor since the last time that we were discussing
22 this corridor. We've had over 450 meetings over the course
23 of the last several years. We do communicate in two
24 languages in this corridor and we have recently gone
25 through a series of community meetings just last fall to

1 get input into this plan.

2 Again, a very similar timeline for this corridor
3 with a draft environmental document in spring of 2017 and
4 then a final environmental document in the winter of 2017.

5 And finally, we have an informational -- just a
6 little bit of information on our Los Angeles to San Diego
7 Project Section. This is the longest single project
8 section in the current high-speed rail system right now.
9 It closes a rail gap between Riverside County and San Diego
10 County. You cannot currently take a train up that inland
11 route, so that's very exciting.

12 Because it's 170 miles there are a number of
13 stations that are under consideration and you can see those
14 listed here. Those stations include stations in Los
15 Angeles County, San Bernardino County, Riverside County and
16 San Diego County. Key station locations would be
17 connectivity at the Ontario Airport and at the San Diego
18 International Airport, both international airports by the
19 way.

20 Key consideration certainly is the connection
21 between these four counties and a really wide variety of
22 communities, so very, very different concerns as you travel
23 between these different communities. And good coordination
24 with other regional planning efforts that are going on in
25 all of those areas.

1 Here is the map. You can see that there are
2 still some very big decisions to make for our Phase 2
3 corridor down here. And we continue to work with the
4 Southern California Inland Corridor Group as we advance the
5 analysis of this particular section. We are very focused
6 on continuing to move the planning forward on this and are
7 planning currently to complete an alternative analysis
8 document to update and refine the routes you see here by
9 the end of 2017.

10 Here is a list of some of the recent activities
11 that we've undertaken, and some of the importance including
12 potential Coachella Valley service, improved transit
13 connections, and things of that nature that we want to make
14 sure we're collaborating with.

15 And with that, I conclude my presentation.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Let me give a moment for my
17 colleagues to reposition. Thank you, Ms. Boehm.

18 Questions from Board Members on the materials
19 that Ms. Boehm presented?

20 (No audible response.)

21 Okay. Well, I think with that I just want to say
22 that this is part of a process. We continue to evolve as
23 Michelle Boehm just described. And there is a formal
24 environmental process that will continue to look at these
25 issues for which we have to identify and analyze

1 mitigations.

2 And the Supplemental Alternatives Analysis
3 issuance is not a decision by this body. It's simply a
4 guide for where we are in the process now and as Ms. Boehm
5 laid out this continues through the end of next year. So
6 there will be other opportunities for community input. We
7 certainly hear the calls for outreach and engagement and
8 we'll be working with our staff on that.

9 And with that, I would thank everybody for their
10 attentiveness through this long day, thank the members of
11 the public again. And we'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

12 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: So moved.

13 BOARD MEMBER LOWENTHAL: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Moved and seconded by
15 everybody. Thank you.

16 (Chairperson Dan Richard adjourned the Public Meeting of
17 The High-Speed Rail Authority
18 at 2:11 p.m.)

19 --oOo--

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 21st day of January, 2016.



MARTHA L. NELSON

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 26th day of April, 2016.



Myra Severtson
Certified Transcriber
AAERT No. CET**D-852